

**THE INFLUENCE OF BIBLICAL TEACHING AND CHURCH  
PARTICIPATION ON MARITAL COMMITMENT AND  
ADJUSTMENT OF EVANGELICAL COUPLES OF FILIPINAS  
WITH NORTH AMERICAN CAUCASIAN HUSBANDS**

by

**LAN MOY PFEIL**

Submitted in accordance with the requirements  
for the degree of

**DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY**

in the subject

**PRACTICAL THEOLOGY**

at the

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**PROMOTER: DR G. J. LE ROUX**

**NOVEMBER 2006**

Student number: 3404-312-8

**DECLARATION**

**“I declare that**

*The influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment of Evangelical couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands*

**is my own work and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references”.**



.....  
SIGNATURE  
(MRS L. PFEIL)

Nov. 30, 2006  
.....  
DATE

## **Acknowledgement**

My gratitude would first and foremost be directed to God who has allowed me the resources in health, strength, access to libraries, and people who were willing to participate in the study.

I thank God for my husband Roger, who has been supportive and encouraging throughout the whole process of this work, and for our children Renata and Nathanael, Tirsa, Efraim, and our grandchildren Katrien, Anika and Meira, with whom I have learned much about the meaning of commitment and adjustment.

I thank Dr Gerhard LeRoux for believing in my potential to accomplish this project and for his gracious and helpful guidance.

I am grateful for UNISA that provides a long-distance continued education for persons like me, whose circumstances would not allow the opportunity for time in classrooms.

## ABSTRACT

This study is on the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment of Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. The project is based on literature research and fieldwork.

Consideration was given to literature on intercultural marriage, Biblical theology on intercultural marriage, and on pertinent Philippine and North American mainstream cultural values.

The sample in the field research consists of 23 couples. Each spouse was interviewed by phone for one hour. Thus, 46 one-hour interviews were conducted that included assessment of demographic and church activity data; levels of the couples' marital commitment and adjustment, and a personal interview.

The study found that Biblical teaching functioned as a constraining force against divorce, as the principle for unconditional sacrificial love, and as a guiding principle in dealing with differences and adjustments. It was the foundation on which the couples attempted to establish common values for their marriage life. Joint church participation that is adequate gave them a sense of extended family; a sense of being rooted and belonging together as a couple and their children; and spiritual nurture. It helped establish a common Evangelical Christian identity, regardless of their diverse cultures or previous religious backgrounds. The study also points to potential improvements for churches in ministering to intercultural couples.

**Key terms:** Evangelical marriage; intercultural marriage; marital commitment; marital adjustment; church and culture; Filipino cultural values, American cultural values.

## CONTENTS

<b>Chapter I: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Problem	
1.2.1 Situation in North America	1
1.2.2 Situation in the Philippines	3
1.3 Theological Framework	5
1.3.1 The universality and unity of believers in Jesus Christ	6
1.3.2 The basic principles for Christian marriage is in the Bible	9
1.3.3 The centrality of the marriage covenant in Biblical teaching	10
1.3.4 The relevance of mutual care and church participation	10
1.3.5 Conclusion	13
1.4 Rationale	13
1.4.1 There is no specific literature on premarital or marital counseling for Evangelical intercultural marriage	13
1.4.2 Studies on intracultural marriages indicate positive influences of religious orientation and church participation on marital relationship	14
1.4.3. Studies on intercultural marriages find that intercultural marriages are not necessarily hopeless	15
1.5 Conclusion	16
1.6 Research questions and hypothesis	16
1.6.1 Research questions	17
1.6.2 Hypothesis	17
1.7 Definitions	17
1.7.1 Biblical teaching	17
1.7.2 Evangelical	18
1.7.3 Intercultural	20
1.7.4 Filipina	22
1.7.5 North American Caucasian men	22
1.7.6 Commitment	22
1.7.7 Adjustment	24
1.7.8 Church participation	25

1.7.9	The influence of Biblical teaching and church participation	26
1.8	Fieldwork	26
1.8.1	Sample	26
1.8.2	Assessment	27
1.9	Delimitation	29
1.9.1	Cultural background	29
1.9.2	Gender choice	30
1.9.3	Years of marriage	30
1.10	Summary	31
<b>Chapter II: Literature Review</b>		<b>33</b>
2.1	Literature on intercultural marriage	34
2.1.1	Definition of terms	34
2.1.2	Literature category according to emphasis	40
2.2	Literature of Biblical theology on intercultural marriage	81
2.2.1	Intercultural marriage in the Old Testament	82
2.2.2	Intercultural marriage in the New Testament	88
2.2.3	Segregation or integration	100
2.2.4	Conclusion	123
2.3	Literature of Evangelical perspective on relevant issues of marriage	124
2.3.1	The Bible teaches God's basic plan and purpose in marriage	125
2.3.2	Covenant commitment in marriage	127
2.3.3	The role of husband and wife	138
2.3.4	Divorce and remarriage	151
2.3.5	Conservative or liberal view of marriage and family	162
2.3.6	Conclusion	164
2.4	Mainstream Philippine cultural values	165
2.4.1	Filipino core values and children's upbringing	166
2.4.2	Gender role	179
2.4.3	Modernization and changes in values	184
2.4.4	Filipino values among Filipinos in North America	190
2.4.5	Conclusion	194

2.5 Mainstream North American values	195
2.5.1 Dominant cultural values	195
2.5.2 Social class and differences in values	201
2.5.3 Changes in traditional values	203
2.5.4 Conclusion	214
2.6 Literature of research on the influence of religious orientation and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment	216
2.6.1 Religious orientation and marriage relationship	216
2.6.2 Marital satisfaction	219
2.6.3 Marital commitment	222
2.6.4 Marital adjustment	231
2.6.5 Church participation and marriage relationship	237
2.6.6 Cultural implication	239
2.6.7 Conclusion	241
<b>Chapter III: Fieldwork</b>	244
3.1 Method	244
3.1.1 Sample	244
3.1.2 Means of communication	245
3.2 Procedure	247
3.2.1 Preparation	247
3.2.2 Process of the interview	250
3.3 Assessment instruments	252
3.3.1 Questionnaire 1	252
3.3.2 Questionnaire 2	253
3.3.3 Questionnaire 3	255
3.3.4 Questionnaire 4	263
3.3.5 Personal interview	266
3.3.6 Analysis	282
3.4 Results	283
3.4.1 The results of the questionnaires	285
3.4.2 The results of the personal interview	292

3.5 Discussion	356
3.5.1 The significance of the demographic information	357
3.5.2 The influence of Biblical teaching on marital commitment and adjustment	361
3.5.3 The influence of church participation on marital commitment and adjustment	392
3.5.4 Residence in North America or in the Philippines	404
3.5.5 Conclusion	407
<b>Chapter IV: Summary and Implication</b>	418
4.1 Purpose and objective	418
4.2 Design and method	422
4.3 Findings	424
4.4 Limitations	430
4.5 Implications	431
4.5.1 Implication for further study	431
4.5.2 Implication for Evangelical churches	431
4.5.3 Implication for premarital and marital counseling	433
<b>Bibliography</b>	434
<b>Appendices:</b>	
1. Informed consent	453
2. Information on procedure	454
3. Questionnaire 1	455
4. Questionnaire 2	456
5. Questionnaire 3	457
6. Questionnaire 4	458
7. A Christian Declaration on Marriage	460

## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION

#### **1.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to examine how Biblical teaching on marriage and church participation effect marital commitment and adjustment of Evangelical couples of Filipinas with North American husbands. The result of the study is to contribute to the field of pastoral counseling by providing better understanding and more specific focus in premarital and marital counseling with Evangelical intercultural couples.

#### **1.2 The problem**

There is a challenge of the rising trends of intercultural marriages, and there is a need to meet them constructively. There is a gap in literature on intercultural/interracial marriage of Evangelical Filipina-North American couples. Thus, it is of interest to ask: How can the Evangelical churches minister more effectively to such couples in their congregations?

##### **1.2.1 Situation in North America**

Prinzing and Prinzing (1991:105-106) suggest that relatively few families will be able to avoid the issue of intercultural dating and marriage in the coming decade. They maintain that Christians need to deal with the issue of intercultural and interracial marriages that occur among Christians. However, the Evangelical churches have largely remained silent on this matter. When they have spoken the messages were mixed.

While the Evangelical church has become more and more intercultural in nature and in general intercultural marriage is on the increase (Prinzing and Prinzing 1991; Johnson and Warren 1994), there seem to be a scarcity of literature on Evangelical intercultural marriage in general, and none on the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment of intercultural marriage in particular. While there has been literature on Roman Catholic Filipinas who married foreigners, there is no such literature regarding Evangelical Filipinas.

Hurding (1995:78) state: “Pastoral care is the practical outworking of the church's concern for the everyday ultimate needs of its members and the wider community”. De Jongh van Arkel (1993:75) referring to Bell et al. (1976:103-115) presents a list of the general nature of types of problems that people bring to their minister, priest or rabbi. In this regard, 24, 3 percent of the incidence is associated with family problems and 15 percent with marital problems. Thus, even when cultural issues are not mentioned, 39, 3 percent of the incidence are family and marriage issues. Consequently, marriage and family issues of church members, whether intracultural or intercultural, are some of the perennial concerns for pastoral care.

Moreover, as international marriages become more common, it is expedient to consider Augsburger's statement (1993:129): “Pastoral psychotherapy at the beginning of the twenty-first century dare under no circumstances remain local and mono-cultural”. In his earlier writing, Augsburger (1986:13) asserts: “The pastoral counselor in a world of accelerated change must be an intercultural person”. In this regard he intends to stress the cultural awareness of the pastoral counselor.

Gottman (1994:16) submits that according to a 1989 study of U. S. Census, 67% or two out of every three new couples are headed for divorce, unless something changes. He also reports that his research shows that much more important than having compatibility is how couples work out their differences (Gottman 1994:24). Considering that this is the situation among same culture marriages, it would be

worthwhile to find out how intercultural couples could adjust and stay committed in marriage.

Further, Johnson and Warren (1994) write: “The incidence of intermarriage is increasing, yet intermarriage is still considered the “last taboo” in personal relationships”. Added to that, Simmons (2001:279) submits that her data support the findings of Chuah's Australian research. Chuah (1987) finds that the emotional opposition to intermarriage stems from an implicit racist assumption that such a marriage is somehow “unnatural”.

The world has become more and more globally linked and the movements of peoples have provided breeding grounds for intercultural unions. Already in 1966, Gordon in his study on the process of assimilation of ethnic groups in the United States concludes that assimilation begins with cultural aspects and ends with civic assimilation. Gordon (1966:54) views intermarriage as the product of urbanization, mobility, propinquity and other significant social factors. Also, Baron (1972), Cerroni-Long (1984), and Root (1996) point to the social trends toward liberalization from endogamy and change to the acceptance of exogamy in America.

### **1.2.2 Situation in the Philippines**

Historically, in the Philippines interracial and intercultural mixing has been practiced for a long time. The evolution of the nation, culture and ethnicity shows evidences of interracial and intercultural blending. In addition, currently a large number of its citizens reside overseas.

There are over eighty dialects in the Philippines, among which Visayan, Tagalog and Ilocano are the three major ones. Tagalog became the Philippines' national language on Dec. 30, 1937 according to the constitution of the Philippine Commonwealth. Nevertheless, English is the “lingua franca”. It is the medium of communication throughout the nation, and it is also the language of the educated in contemporary

Philippines. Because of the fluency in English, Filipinos can communicate relatively easy with foreigners. They can work in foreign countries, and many foreigners visit or live in the Philippines.

Ethnically, the Filipinos have diverse origins. There were various waves of peoples who came to settle in the Philippines. Literature before the 1970s assumes that the earliest settlers were the Negritos (Aetas) from Asia. However, this theory is now severely criticized (Agoncillo and Guerrero 1987:21).

There were several waves of Indonesians who came to settle here in antiquity. In the 13<sup>th</sup> century AD the Philippines was part of the Indonesian Hindu Empire Sri-Vishaya. The Malays first came during the 3<sup>rd</sup>. century AD. Around 1478 AD the second wave of Malays arrived. Many of them were Mohammedans. They later settled in Southern Mindanao. They are the forefathers of the present Filipino Muslims. The Chinese began settling in the Philippines around the 14<sup>th</sup> century AD. They were traders. These men married Filipinas. The Chinese assimilated into the country's mainstream.

However, the Philippines appeared in the world history by the event of the death of Fernando Magellan. Warriors killed him under chief Lapu-Lapu on Mactan Island, Cebu, in April 1521 AD. In 1565 the Spaniards returned to colonize the Philippines for more than three hundred years. Hence, the Philippines were named after King Philip II of Spain. The United States defeated the Spaniards and the Americans occupied the country from Feb.6 1899 to July 4, 1946 with a brief interval of the Japanese occupation of the Philippines during the Pacific war.

Today, most intermarriage is among Filipino overseas workers. Many of the men or women intermarry with people of the country where they work (Saintjareth). The 2001 Survey on Overseas Filipinos (SOF) and Gender Quickstat 2002 indicated that the number of overseas foreign workers had reached 1,030,000. They were spread out over the continent of Asia, Africa, Australia, North and South America. Among

them, 582 thousand (51.3%) were males and 501 thousand (48%) were females. During the 6-month period observed, the number of the female OFWs (Overseas Foreign Workers) rose by 11.1%, while the male OFWs only increased by 0.2. The increased number of the females was observed in the age group of 20 to 34 years old. These are women of marriageable age. The highest number of OFWs is in the U. S. A.

The Manila daily newspaper *The Manila Times*, reported in an article on June 9, 1993, that one of every three emigrants married foreigners. The article claimed to have based the information on figures made available by the Commission on Overseas Filipinos, which showed that out of 64,172 Filipino emigrants in 1992, 18, 933 emigrated on a fiancée or spouse visa. The *Philippine Daily Inquirers*, a Manila daily paper, reported on June 7, 1996, that 60 Filipinas married foreigners daily to join their husbands abroad.

Thus, trends toward intercultural marriages in general and among the Evangelicals, both in North America and in the Philippines, are increasing. The Evangelical churches need to face the challenge of the augmented marriage counseling field to include the issues of intercultural marriage that are occurring among Evangelicals. Greater understanding, a more adequate method and material to effectively address the issue of intermarriage would be needed.

### **1.3 Theological Framework**

Four basic considerations supportive for the choice of topic for this thesis are: (1) the universality and unity of believers in Jesus Christ, (2) the basic principles for Christian marriage found in the Bible, (3) the centrality of the covenant marriage concept in Biblical teaching on marriage, and (4) the relevance of mutual care in church participation.

### **1.3.1 The universality of believers in Jesus Christ**

In the OT time exogamy of the Israelites with the pagan gentiles was forbidden for the preservation of the people of God and their faithfulness to the covenant God of Abraham. The prohibition was for the preservation of the “seed of Abraham” through which all the nations were to be blessed (Epstein 1942; Werman 1997; Hayes 1999; Rudolph 1949; van Oyen 1967; Sailhamer 1992).

The NT considers believers of all cultures, races or gender as equals in Jesus Christ. The body of Christ is universal. The barriers for differences of nationalities and races have been removed (Col 3:11; Rom 11:25-26, 32; Gal 3:28; Eph 2:15). Christ is the head of the body, which is the church. All believers are children of God through faith in Christ (Gal 3:26-29). In Christ, there is no division according to race, cultural or social status (Col 3: 11). Jesus expressed his desire in his priestly prayer that all who believe in him may be one (Jn 17:20-23).

Even before the message of salvation was carried to the gentile world, the message of salvation in Christ was meant for all nations. This is evident in the Gospels. Commentaries affirm the universal and unity stance of the Gospels. No prohibition against intercultural marriage between believers in Christ is found in the NT, although the NT is against union of believers with unbelievers (2 Cor 6:14-18; 1 Cor 7:39), and against sexual immorality (1 Cor 6:15-20).

Christian scholars and writers underline the universality and the unity of believers in Jesus Christ. For example, John Calvin succinctly argued that the church universal is the multitude collected out of all nations, who though dispersed and far distant from each other, agree in one truth of divine doctrines and are bound together by the tie of common religion (Institutes of Religion, Book IV, chap. 1, section 9).

Erickson (1989:1035) expresses that the church is constituted of God's people. They belong to him and he belongs to them. In the OT, God did not adopt an existing

nation as his own, but he created a people for himself. In the NT this concept of God's choosing a people is broadened to include Jews and Gentiles within the church (2 Thess 1:4). Erickson concludes that in the OT, the old covenant, God's people had been national Israel. However, in the NT, God's people were not established by national identity, but by faith in Christ. Here he refers to Rom 9: 6, 24 and 2 Cor 3:3-18. Also, the metaphor of the body of Christ speaks of the interconnectedness between all the persons who make up the church (Erickson 1989:1037).

Swindoll (1995:334) also emphasizes the interconnectedness in the church that is "ekklesia". "Ekklesia" signifies all the people who are called-out from among the non-believing world to be part of the body of Christ. He points out that in the body of Christ there must be unity and harmony (1 Cor 12:12), and no favoritism or prejudice (1 Cor 12:13). In the body of Christ there is an emphasis of individual dignity and mutual variety (1 Cor 14-20). The church as the body of Christ has many members or organs, and they are interrelated. Each organ has its proper function (1 Cor 12:21-26). Thus, Swindoll believes that a healthy church must have certain vital signs of good health, such as, the presence of unity and harmony, the absence of favoritism and prejudice, the emphasis on individual dignity and mutual variety, and the de-emphasis of independence and self-sufficiency. On the other hand, there is support for others whether they are hurting or they receive honor. Last but not least, Christ is exalted as the head and supreme authority in this body (Swindoll, 1995:341-344). Thus, if there were unity in such a body of Christ, racial or cultural prejudices would be ideally inconceivable.

Berkhof (1979:396) argues that most communions and corporations we know are for instance, based on oneness of blood, of interests, or of purposes. However, the Christian communion must prove its distinctiveness by going beyond all these boundaries. He believes that it should get all people involved in it, including those who are excluded by other communions: the guilty, the lonely, strangers, the unimportant, the retarded, and those without voice. Thus, this concept would suggest the inclusion of people from different cultures.

In the same tone, based on Col 3:11, Tidball (Atkinson and Field 1995:47) submits that church fellowship is not a community based on the sharing of a common interest, but a participation in the receipt of grace. It makes for an equality of love. In his view, fellowships that are formed exclusively on the basis of a common interest, in race, color, sex, class, status, age, or even moral background, are illegitimate as church fellowship.

As to the solution for racial problems, Maston (1959:26) stresses that it cannot be found apart from the family spirit. This stems from the unity of God, who is the Father and who is redemptive in His purposes. Eph 4:1-6 states: “There is one body and one Spirit, just as also you were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all who is over all and through all and in all”.

This position of universality and unity among believers in Christ is affirmed in the constitution of the National Association of Evangelicals' statement of faith. Art. III, no. 7 states that the Evangelical Christians believe in the spiritual unity of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. The NAE also purposes to encourage a recognition of and appreciation for the multiethnic nature of the family of God (NAE constitution, implications). All believers are equal before God. It is God's decision to make believers his people (2 Cor 6:16).

In reality, although shared faith in Christ is the solution to racial and cultural struggles, having the same faith does not automatically come with cultural adjustment between two people from different backgrounds. Johnson and Warren (1994:1) suggest that marriage is more than a relationship between individuals. It is a relationship between groups. It signifies accepting equality between the groups. Needless to add, differences in cultural values are contemplated in the acceptance.

Intercultural marriage includes a joining of two cultures parallel to the integration of people from different cultures into one church family. Robertson (1980:40) discusses the idea of "grafting" and "pruning". He submits that from the history of Abraham's covenant, the "ingrafting" of those who were not Israelites by birth was possible (Gen. 17:12, 13). In the NT this principle is applied to the gentiles (Rom 11:17, 19). People from all nations can become vital aspects of the branch of God's people by faith.

Following the metaphor of "grafting" two plants, it would only make sense, if these have something vitally in common. For, we do not graft apples trees with orange trees. In the integration of peoples, it suggests that the two groups have a common faith as the essential basis for the union. Likewise, in the context of marriage, when two partners from diverse cultures enter into marriage union, an integration process is to take place.

### **1.3.2 The basic principles for Christian marriage are in the Bible**

The concept of marriage is implicitly stated in the Bible as early as in the first two chapters of Genesis. God created male and female and they are blessed to be fruitful and to multiply (Gen 1:24-28). Gen 2:18, 20 states the creation of the woman as "ezer kenegdo" (suitable helper) for the man, and Gen 2:21-23 describes God's design of the marriage union in a meaningful way culminating in the profound statement of marriage union in Gen 2:24.

Marriage is not only mentioned in the beginning chapters of Genesis, before sin ruined perfect human relationships. It is mentioned in many places in the Bible such as, Prov 5: 18-19; The Song of Songs; Mal 2:13-16; 1 Cor 7; Matt 19:4-9; Eph 5:22-31; 1; Pe 3:1-7, and so forth. Evangelical Christian writers in marriage strongly affirm the view that the Bible provides the basic principles for Christian marriage, for instance Christenson (1970), Barber (1974), Gangle (1977), Adams (1980),

Worthington (1989; 1999), Wright (1992) and others. This is also true even for Gundry (1977:1980), who is known for her feminist leaning.

### **1.3.3 The centrality of the marriage as a covenant concept in Biblical teaching**

The decision to marry is not to be taken lightly (Gen 2:24; Mt 19:6; Mal 2:5-16; Eph5:22-33). It involves a serious permanent commitment. It is more than a relationship for convenience. It needs unconditional or sacrificial love. It includes commitment in making adjustments (Anderson and Guernsey 1985; Balswick and Balswick 1991; Clark 1995; Stanley et al. 2001). Balswick and Balswick (1991) propose the centrality of the concept of covenant in Biblical Theology of marriage.

Even in intra-cultural marriage, partners need to be committed and to make adjustments in their marriage relationship (Gottman 1995). Cultural values are foreseeable hurdles to overcome for intercultural couples. Unconditional sacrificial love because of Christ would be all the more significant in maintaining a covenant marital commitment.

It is worthy of notice that, in celebration of the end of the millennium, on Nov. 14, 2000, several Christian groups in the U. S. jointly issued a "Christian Declaration on Marriage". This manifesto on Christian marriage underlines the permanency of marriage as a covenant, and the Biblical basis for the position. The signers were leaders of several major Evangelical denominations. Also, the leader of The National Conference of Catholic Bishops was one of the signers.

### **1.3.4 The relevance of mutual care and church participation**

Heitink (1999:291) argues that the core themes of ecclesiastics have to do with the actual functioning of the church in the context of modern culture. One of the core concepts is that of koinonia. The idea of koinonia as the social manifestation of the Christian faith leads to the central concept in biblical-theological ecclesiology

(Heitink 1999:277). In his discussion of this concept he refers to Kuhnke (1992), who believes that the credibility of the Christian faith depends on whether Christians succeed in developing a way of life, in which the weaknesses of the modern lifestyle are diagnosed and overcome.

Further, de Jongh van Arkel (1992:75-76) referring to Heitink (1983:39) writes: "In the Christian church mutual care is the basic form of all pastoral care. Dedicated responsibility for one another, expressed in loving care, is an essential part of the church". The mutual care and accountability relationship in the church community would presumably even be more expected in Evangelical churches. Many Evangelical churches are congregational in their system of governance. This model stresses the general priesthood of believers (de Jongh van Arkel 1992:76-81). Relevant Biblical references in this regard are Ex 19: 5f.; 1 Pe 2:9; Isa 61:6; Rev 1: 6, and 5:10. Also, Berkhof (1979:403) mentions that the concept of the general priesthood of believers was a very important idea in the Reformation.

Further, according to Furet (1986:75) mutual paraklesis entails far more than an experience of group loyalty or sense of community. It is essential for participation in salvation, and for life in "the consolation of Christ". Living in the sphere of salvation is living in responsibility for one another. Thus, de Jongh van Arkel (1988:4) points out that it means living our redemption in Christ and executing our call to be Christ to one another and to others (Matt 25:3-46), to bear one another's burden (Gal 6:2), and to endure other's failings (Rom 15:1). Therefore, mutual care embodies "ekklesia" and "koinonia".

Tidball (1995:45-46) notes the therapeutic element in a church community. He emphasizes for instance, acceptance and forgiveness, compassion, and unconditional love. He also believes that the NT stresses the aspect of Christians ministering to one another (Gal 5: 13; 6:2; Eph 4:2, 32; Col 3:16; 1 Thess 3:12; 4:9, 18; 1 Pe 4:9; 5:5; 1 Jn 3:23). Nevertheless, he also recognizes the importance of regular ministers whose

primary occupation is in serving in the pastorate. The Bible indicates that there are regular ministers (1 Cor 9:7-14; Gal 6: 6).

Edification is a significant aspect in church participation. Although Evangelism is of utmost importance, worship, edification, and social concern are also roles of the church. Paul repeatedly spoke of the edification of the body. Eph 4:12 mentions that God gives various gifts to the church for the equipment of the saints, for the work of ministry, for building up of the body of Christ. Believers are to grow up into Christ (v. 16). Erickson (1989:1051-1067) submits that there can be several means for edification of church members. Erickson considers fellowship (*koinonia*) as one of the means. He refers to Acts 5 (having everything in common), 1 Cor 12: 26 (sharing in suffering, honor, and joy), and Gal 6:2 (bearing one another's burden). Also, Matt 18:15-17 and 1 Cor 5:1-2 imply correction. Instruction or teaching is part of discipleship (Matt 28:20 mandates to teach disciples to observe all that Jesus has commanded). Eph 4:11 states that God gives the gifts of pastors and teachers to the churches. In Acts 18:26, Priscilla and Aquilla invited Apollos and corrected him. He continued his ministry with even greater effectiveness. Erickson adds that education in the church may be in various forms and levels.

Another aspect of church participation is worship. Edification focuses on the believers, and worship concentrates on God. Heb 10:25 exhorts not to neglect congregating together. Worshipping in church concentrates on God, but it also benefits the worshippers. Erickson (1989:1057) maintains that Paul warns against prayers, songs, and thanksgivings that do not edify, because no one can understand, as there is no interpreter (1Cor 14:15-17). Thus, in worship church members exalt God and edify one another.

Lastly, from church historical perspective, Hellerman (2001:225) stresses the centrality of the family matrix in the early history of the Christian church. From the first-century Palestine to the third-century Carthage, the most important early Christian conception of community was that of the surrogate kinship group of

siblings, who understood themselves to be the sons and daughters of God. He expresses that the corporate nature and the surrogate sibling bond were the prominent and attractive features of the church then.

### **1.3.5 Conclusion**

Thus, those four points were relevant theological considerations underlying the study. They are: the ideas of universality and unity in Christ that allow intercultural and interracial marriage of believers, the common acceptance of Evangelicals that basic principles for Christian marriage are in the Bible, the importance of Biblical concepts of covenant marriage and sacrificial love for marital commitment, and the role of mutual care in church community. Therefore, the fieldwork investigates the impact of Biblical teaching on the intercultural couples' marital relationship, particularly on the practice of marriage commitment; the influence of Biblical teaching in the process of the couples' adjustment, and the benefits to the marriage from the practice of mutual care and edification in church participation.

## **1.4. Rationale**

### **1.4.1 There is no specific literature on premarital and marital counseling for Evangelical intercultural marriage.**

Christian marriage counseling, marriage enrichment and premarital counseling have mostly been intended to strengthen intracultural marriages. Christian literature on mate-selection tends to warn people against intercultural dating and marriage, because of the difficulties of cultural adjustment in such a relationship. There is no literature to help deal with issues in Evangelical intercultural marriages.

Although Prinzing and Prinzing (1991) treat Evangelical Black and White intermarriage, their focus is on racism. There have been publications of Filipina intercultural marriage with different nationals. They are on Roman Catholic Filipinas

(see II. Literature on intercultural marriage). None of the literature focuses on the effects of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment. In this regard, our study will be exploratory in nature.

#### **1.4.2 Studies on intracultural marriages indicate positive influences of religious orientation and church participation on marital relationship.**

Studies on intra-cultural North American marriages have shown that religious orientation and joint church participation can have a positive influence on couples' marital relationship. For example, Brock (2001) finds that the Christian faith can strengthen spousal commitment in marriages of differing personality types in stressful times, when both spouses have an equal relationship with Christ.

Pramann (1986) maintained that traditional theology and Biblical data suggest a relationship between one's commitment to God and the commitment to one's spouse. Also, commitment is an important factor influencing the spouses' ability to be more accommodating to one another (Rusbult and Verette 1991; Rusbult et al. 1991). Robinson (1994) finds that religious faith serves as means for guidance in couples' dealing with decisions and conflicts.

Moreover, religious commitment and church attendance are correlated with increased levels of marital dependency, self-identification and marital homogamy (Wilson and Musick 1996), and with levels of marital satisfaction (Bahr and Chadwick 1985). Hughes (1999) in an unpublished study of same-faith marriages finds that the couples, which reported different levels of religious commitment were significantly less satisfied with their marital communication than were couples that reported similar levels of commitment (Hughes 2001:17). He also found that couples, which are religiously intrinsic, are generally happier in their marriages and in their marital communication than those that are religiously extrinsic, or those that are of different faiths (Hughes 2001).

Quinn (1984), Ortega et al. (1988), Larson and Goltz (1989), Robinson (1994), Wilson and Musick (1996), Call and Heaton (1997), and Wilson et al. (1997) found positive influence on certain aspects of couples' marital satisfaction, commitment, or adjustment (see 2.5 Literature of research on the influence of religious orientation and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment)

### **1.4.3 Studies on intercultural marriages find that intercultural marriages are not necessarily hopeless.**

Literature on intercultural marriage stresses the aspect of dealing with differences in values. Cottrell (1990), and Chan and Smith (1995) submit that the stability, satisfaction, or conflicts of intercultural couples were not caused by the fact of their race or ethnicity per se, but by the attitudes to race and cultures of the couples, the in-laws and the society around them. Falicov (1995) proposes a guideline for counseling intercultural couples in finding cultural bridges or cultural transition that will lead to the development of the couple's unique "new culture".

Dugan Romano (2001:30-31) describes the "dream-couples" among interculturally married people as those who know and accept that their marriages are lifetime negotiations. Further, Simmons (2001:279) concludes that problems in international marriages stem from the same problems likely to exist in all marriages. The challenges may be heightened by differences of background and culture, but at the same time these potential obstacles provide motivation for heightened effort at overcoming them.

Thus, intercultural marriages do not have to end in disasters, nor are they necessarily worse than intracultural marriages. It is worthwhile to study the influence of Biblical orientation and church participation on Evangelical intercultural couples' marital commitment and adjustment. There is merit to find out how spouses of distinct cultural and racial background can have an enduring marriage, in order to find better

ways to counsel others who are contemplating such marriage, or who are facing the special challenges of being in intercultural marriage.

### **1.5 Conclusion**

The impetus for undertaking this study is derived from the following realization: there are rising trends toward intercultural marriage; theological consideration arrives at a conclusion that there is no Biblical rejection against intercultural marriage among believers in Christ; the church functions as a family in the Spirit and there is mutual care in the church community; and several studies on intracultural couples confirm the positive impact of religious orientation and church participation on marital relationship. However, there seems to be an absence of literature on Evangelical intercultural marriages, and on literature for premarital or marital counseling geared toward this population.

### **1.6 Research Questions and Hypothesis**

The Bible teaches that all believers from different cultures and races are part of the church family. Hellerman (2001:225) explains that in the early church Christian conception of community was that it functioned as kinship group of siblings, who understood themselves to be sons and daughters of God. For the early Christians, the church was a family. At present, members in the Christian church are to show responsibility and care for one another (Firet 1986; de Jongh van Arkel 1992; Heitink 1999). Also, Biblical teaching on marriage union instills covenant commitment, which implies the process of making mutual adjustment between spouses (Anderson and Guernsey 1985; Balswick and Balswick 1991; Stanley et al. 2002). The process of serious and continuous adjustments conceivably requires commitment.

Therefore, this study explores the relationship between Biblical teaching and church participation to marital commitment and adjustment in marriages where the partners

are from different cultural and racial backgrounds, specifically Filipinas married to North American Caucasian men.

Thus, the following are the research questions and hypothesis:

### **1.6.1 Research questions**

12. How does Biblical teaching influence marital commitment and marital adjustment of the intercultural couples?
13. How does church participation influence marital commitment and adjustment of the intercultural couples?

### **1.6.2 Hypotheses**

Biblical teaching on marriage and positive experience of church participation strengthen marital commitment and adjustment of couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands.

## **1.7 Definitions**

"Biblical teaching", "Evangelical", "intercultural", "Filipina", "Caucasian North American", "adjustment", "commitment", and "church participation" are explained here.

### **1.7.1 Biblical teaching**

"Biblical teaching" refers to principles drawn from what is written in the OT and the NT by interpreting, paraphrasing, analyzing and resynthesizing the material and applying them to the given situation. Erickson phrases it as, saying what Jesus (or Paul, etc.) would say today to this situation (Erickson 1985:37, referring to Biblical

message). For the preparation of sermons, Pieterse (1992:57-65) elaborates the various hermeneutical angles that can be pursued in the attempt to understand Biblical texts: grammatical-historical exegesis, historical-critical exegesis, the salvation-historical method, and the structural-analytical method. He also acknowledges the difficulty of grasping the meaning of a text that is based on situations so far remote in historical times. Added to that, there are personal biases, which can interfere in the way one perceives the meaning of a text.

Pieterse presents a list of guidelines for the process of interpretation of a text in its context: 1. Language (Palmer 1969:201-209). 2. Shared reality with the Biblical authors, which is human reality (Bultmann 1968:211-235). 3. Shared concern with the Biblical authors. This involves understanding about faith in God and the experience of God's salvation (Dingemans 1991:78). 4. Our cultural heritage and tradition, which have been influenced by the Biblical messages for centuries. 5. The Holy Spirit's enlightenment in our minds as we interpret the text.

Thus, although the Word of God is absolutely true, one may be confronted with different views as to how people see the meaning of a text. Some examples of this reality are in the diversity of views on several family values among the Evangelicals (Hardgrove 1983; Airhart and Bendroth 1996), or in the debate between the traditional and egalitarian view of gender-role, or in the positions on divorce (see 2.3 Literature of Evangelical perspectives on relevant issues of marriage).

In this regard, the fieldwork does not intend to explore theological debates on which group has the correct Biblical teaching on marriage, rather it is more to learn what Biblical teaching has been influential in the couples' marriage relationship.

### **1.7.2 Evangelical**

The term "Evangelical" couples specifies couples that profess to be Evangelicals. The study does not intend to test the doctrinal position of the samples. However, they

are Christians who subscribe to certain basic doctrines such as, the supreme authority of the Bible as the source of faith and Christian practice, the deity of Jesus Christ (including his miracles), atoning death and bodily resurrection, salvation as a supernatural work of regeneration and justification by grace through faith, and the second coming of Christ (Erickson 1985:1143).

Further, Burke (1995:360-361) describes the term "Evangelicalism" citing the definition of the 1974 Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization:

*To evangelize is to spread the good news that Jesus Christ died for our sins and was raised from the dead according to the Scriptures, and that as the reigning Lord he now offers the forgiveness of sins and the liberating gift of the Spirit to all who repent and believe* (The Lausanne Covenant, par. 4).

The importance of the Gospel and the proclamation of it are further expressed in the Lausanne Covenant paragraph 4 as follows:

*Our Christian presence in the World is indispensable to evangelism, and so is that kind of dialogue whose purpose is to listen sensitively in order to understand. But evangelism itself is the proclamation of the historical, biblical Christ as Savior and Lord, with a view to persuading people to come to him personally and so be reconciled to God.* (Burke 1995:361).

Furthermore, the NAE's (National Association of Evangelicals) statement of faith professes:

1. *We believe the Bible to be the inspired, the only infallible, authoritative Word of God.*
2. *We believe that there is one God, eternally existent in three persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.*
3. *We believe in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in His virgin birth, in His sinless life, in His miracles, in His vicarious and atoning death through His shed blood, in His bodily resurrection, in His ascension to the right hand of the Father, and in His personal return in power and glory.*

4. *We believe that for the salvation of the lost and sinful people, regeneration by the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential.*
5. *We believe in the present ministry of the Holy Spirit by whose indwelling the Christian is enabled to live a godly life.*
6. *We believe in the resurrection of both the saved and the lost, they that are saved unto the resurrection of life and they that are lost unto the resurrection of damnation.*
7. *We believe in the spiritual unity of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ.*

Gallup poll research of 1980 defines Evangelicals as those, who claim to be "born again". Their activities are aimed at sharing their faith with other people and they hold literal belief in the Bible (Hardgrove 1983:83).

Shortly, Evangelicals are Christians, who affirm the supreme authority of the Bible as the source of faith and practice. They profess of having salvation and personal commitment to Jesus Christ and acknowledge the task to proclaim the Gospel of salvation in Christ. The participants of the study are as such considered Evangelicals, although they are from various denominations.

### **1.7.3 Intercultural**

Hogue (1999) differentiates "intercultural" from "interracial" in that the latter can have a wider sense than the former. A race can be defined as a group of people connected by common descent. They have a more or less unique combination of physical traits transmitted by descent. In other words, they are people who belong to a certain stock. In this sense, the Japanese, the Chinese or the Koreans are racially Asians but they are culturally distinct. Thus, intercultural may include interracial, but intercultural does not always mean interracial at the same time. Intercultural is distinguished by the culture and not by physical appearance.

As to the idea of “common decent” or “common stock”, Westermann (1974:679-680) argues for the importance of the Genesis account in the Bible in explaining the origin of the world and humanity. There is one Creator of all. He also points out that Gen 9:1-17 indicates the same source of all humanity. The diversity of peoples is based on the land where they live, their language, and culture. Further, Maston (1959:24) underlines the statement in Acts 17:26 that God made of “one” common stock every nation to live on all the earth. In other words, ultimately all humanity descended from the same ancestor, despite the different complexion, customs and laws.

Falicov (1988:336) defines culture as those sets of shared worldviews and adaptive behaviors derived from simultaneous membership in variety of contexts. The elements are such as: ecological setting (rural, urban, suburban), religious background, nationality, and ethnicity, gender related experiences, occupation, values of generation and so forth.

With regard to intercultural marriage, Prinzing and Prinzing (1991:11) posit that though "intercultural" is more inclusive, it may or may not involve people of different races. It is possible to marry interracially and at the same time not interculturally and vice versa.

Maretzki (1977:1-2) defines intercultural marriage as a marriage that takes place between spouses of different cultural backgrounds. There are differences in their values, beliefs, customs, tradition or lifestyle. On the other hand, he views interracial marriage in terms of biological difference. In the latter, hereditary elements are present.

The participants of our study are intercultural couples in the sense of being intercultural and interracial. In this case, it is not intercultural in the sense of interreligion, because both partners profess to be Evangelicals, but the wives are Filipinas and the husbands are Caucasian North Americans.

#### **1.7.4 Filipina**

They are Asian women, whose cultural identity belongs to the Philippine mainstream culture, regardless where they are currently living. As previously mentioned, in the history of the Philippine nation there has been interracial and intercultural blending (Andres 1981; Agoncillo and Guerrero 1987; Saintjareth s.a.).

#### **1.7.5 North American Caucasian men**

Literature on mainstream North American values states that these refer to the values of predominantly the White middle and upper class of European ancestry (Steward and Bennet 1991; Preli and Bernard 1993; Althen 2003). North American Caucasian men are those who identify themselves as belonging to the North American Caucasian group, regardless where they are currently living. The study does not contemplate racial purity neither in the Filipinas nor in the North Americans, but for the purpose of establishing the cultural configuration in the study, the terminology is used to delimit the grouping to the dominant or mainstream cultural background of the spouses.

Questionnaire 1 is intended to gather demographic information. It also confirms whether the prospective participants fulfill the criteria stipulated. One criterion is that their intercultural marriage is of the configuration of Philippine and North American mainstream cultural backgrounds.

#### **1.7.6 Commitment**

Anderson and Guernsey (1985:47) express the permanency and unconditional nature of covenant commitment, when they state that it is something one gives to another that cannot be taken away once it is given. In their view, covenant is a theological term whereas commitment is sociological. In other words, Biblically marital commitment is a covenant commitment.

Worthington (1999:69) affirmed covenantal commitment as opposed to contractual commitment. The latter is based on reciprocity or exchange. Thus, such a commitment is individualistic and will last as long as there are pay-offs. He concluded by stating that with covenantal commitment people care for and stay committed to a partner, because they have staked their honor, their word and their identity on fulfilling their covenantal obligations toward the other person regardless of what the other person does or doesn't do. They feel deep within that marriage is sacred (Worthington 1999:70).

Thus, "Commitment" can be defined in various ways. However, Koehne (2000:22-24) points out that in spite of the lack of clarity among definitions of marital commitment, it is still possible to identify recurring dimensions of commitment represented in the research literature.

Commitment to a relationship may be described with respect to three global dimensions. The first common dimension of commitment involves an attractive component. The attractive component is an individual's commitment to his or her partner based on personal dedication, devotion, attachment, and love. The second dimension of commitment involves a constraining force component. External factors may prevent the break up even when the person's motivation to leave the marriage is high (e.g. disapproval of friends, the cost of divorce, concern for the children etc.). The third dimension involves a sense of moral obligation, for example the belief in the sanctity of marriage as a covenant. Thus, referring to Johnson (1991), Koehne concludes that spouses may remain married because they want to (personal commitment), because they ought to (moral commitment), or because they have to (structural commitment).

Stanley and Markman (1992) summarize commitment as two related constructs: personal dedication, and constraint commitment. The first one refers to the desire of an individual to maintain or improve the quality of his or her relationship for the joint

benefit of the participants. It is evidenced by the desire and the associated behavior to continue in the relationship, to improve it, to sacrifice for it, to invest in it, to link personal goals to it, and to seek the partner's welfare, rather than only one's own. To the contrary, constraint commitment refers to internal and external forces that constrain the persons to maintain the relationship regardless of their personal dedication to it.

This study is interested in finding out if Biblical teaching has a strong influence on keeping the Evangelical intercultural couples together, in spite of their differences. Therefore, the field research assesses the levels of dedication and constraint commitment of the participants by applying questionnaire 3, which is based on the CI (Commitment Inventory) of Stanley and Markman (1992). The personal interview is intended to investigate the influence of Biblical teaching on the couples' marital commitment.

### **1.7.7 Adjustment**

Webster dictionary (1989) defines "to adjust" as: to bring to agreement or to cause to conform. Rusbult et al. (1991) conceptualize "accommodation" in their study on an aspect of marital adjustment. They explain it as the willingness to inhibit impulses to react destructively, when the partner has engaged in a potentially destructive act. Thus, in this case the person still reciprocates constructively to the partner.

In other words, "adjustment" assumes that there are differences between the spouses, and in this study the differences are more pronounced, because of the divergent cultural backgrounds and the contrast of cultural values. It involves the way the couple deals with their differences constructively. It concerns the process of making changes in one's own expectations, perceptions and way of life to conform more to the acceptable standard of the spouse, or to accommodate the differences. Gottman (1994:23) views adjustment as an important issue in marriage. According to his research, it is much more important for couples to work out differences than to have

compatibility. Thus, "adjustment" is not about compatibility, but it is about working out differences.

In this study the differences in the levels of adjustment are assessed by applying questionnaire 4. This is the Revised (Adapted) Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Busby et al. 1995). Subsequently, the personal interview discloses the influences of Biblical teaching and church participation on how the intercultural couples make adjustment.

### **1.7.8 Church participation**

Church participation refers to regularity in Sunday church attendance and involvement in other church activities or fellowship on the basis of placing high value on religious belief and being part of a congregation of believers. It is not limited to Sunday morning worship service, but it can include activities such as, Sunday school, choir/worship music practice, church boards meetings, Bible study, cell-group, prayer group and fellowship group, and so forth.

Studies on same culture couples have reported several benefits of church participation for marital stability. Shared church activities have been noted as having a positive influence on marriage relationships (Quinn 1984; Ortega et al. 1988; Larson and Goltz 1989; Robinson 1994; Wilson and Musick 1996; Wilson et al. 1997; Call and Heaton 1997).

Wilson et al. (1997) found that frequency of church attendance increases exposure to like-minded people and results in strengthening certain religious orientation, and with it, certain attitudes and behaviors.

Also, church participation will allow the practice and the experience of mutual care in a congregation that embodies the essence of "ekklesia" and "koinonia" (cf. de Jongh van Arkel 1988:4).

This study will establish the frequency and types of church participation by using questionnaire 2 (church participation questionnaire). However, the impact of church participation on the marriage is disclosed in the personal interview.

### **1.7.9 The influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment**

The fieldwork investigates whether the couples' attitude and practices in maintaining their marital relationship and in making adjustment are based on their understanding of Biblical teaching, or on other influences such as, culture, practical common sense, personal experience, or parental modeling.

In researching the influence of church participation on marital commitment and adjustment, the fieldwork investigates the elements of the couples' church participation that contribute positively to marital endurance and adjustment. The impact of Biblical teaching and church participation to the marital commitment and adjustment is explored in the one-hour personal telephone interview.

## **1.8 Fieldwork**

### **1.8.1 Sample**

The participants are 46 individuals, or 23 Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. The shortest time of having been married is 7.25 years and the longest is 37 years, 20 of the 23 couples have been married for more than 10 years, and 5 among them have been married for over 20 years.

The couples reside in different places in North America and in the Philippines. They were recruited by contacting several Filipino pastors and churches listed in phone directories or websites, and through networks of friends in the U. S., in Canada, and in the Philippines. The participants are Evangelical from various denominations.

## **1.8.2 Assessment**

Four questionnaires and a one-hour personal interview are applied to collect data. The correspondence mainly uses the Internet, and the interview is by telephone.

### 1.8.2.1 Questionnaire 1

Questionnaire 1 is a short demographic assessment, gathering data on age, educational level, cultural background, denominational affiliation, length of marriage, number of children, and length of time in the Evangelical faith.

### 1.8.2.2 Questionnaire 2

Questionnaire 2 assesses the frequency of individual and joint participation in church activities. Both questionnaires 1 and 2 can be filled out within five to seven minutes.

### 1.8.2.3 Questionnaire 3

Questionnaire 3 is to indicate the spouses marital commitment levels, based on the CI (Commitment Inventory) (Stanley and Markman 1992). The CI as a whole consists of 60 items, of which the two primary dimensions are personal dedication and constraint commitment. The Alphas for the two composite dimensions are .92 for constraint and .95 for dedication. Every subscale is reported to meet or exceed .70 (Stanley and Markman 1992; Touliatos et al. 2001). However, not all subscales need to be used together. Only the subscales that are pertinent can be selected, but the items used for the subscales must be mixed randomly rather than putting them in sequence (Stanley and Markman 1992; Touliatos et al. 2001).

Thus, questionnaire 3 applies two subscales for constraint commitment, and two subscales for dedication commitment from the CI. From constraint commitment, four items are for Morality of Divorce (MD), and four items are for Social Pressure (SP). From dedication commitment, four items are Couple Identity (CI), and four items are for Satisfaction with Sacrifice (SS). In total, questionnaire 3 has 16 items. In each of

the group of four, two items are presented in positive statements, and two are negative. The intention of the reverse statements is to confirm the truthfulness of the response. The items are answered on a seven-point Likert scale. The subscales are scored by summing up and averaging items within the dimension. Composite scores for dedication and constraints are determined by averaging scores.

#### 1.8.2.4 Questionnaire 4

Questionnaire 4 is the ADAS (Adapted Dyadic Adjustment Scale), also called RDAS (Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale) (Busby et al. 1995). It is used to assess the couples' marital adjustment levels. The ADAS has 14 items. Response categories are assigned a value from 0 to 5 (or 0 to 4), and then summed up for the total score. The 14-item measurement has an Alpha reliability of .90. This instrument has three higher-order concept of marital quality: consensus, satisfaction, and cohesion. Within these scales there are seven subscales, each consisting of two items.

#### 1.8.2.5. Personal interview

After the spouses have completed the questionnaires by phone, they are separately interviewed. First they are asked, if there are items in the questionnaires that they would like to comment on, or expand. Then the conversation evolves around the following topics: how they met, their expectations for choice of a church, the contribution of their church to the well-being of their marriage, their relationship with the in-laws, leadership in their home, their position on divorce, remarriage, sacrificial love, the value of children, their frequent issue of disagreement and how they deal with the differences. Twelve principal questions that are expandable are asked in the discussion of the topics.

The use of a telephone instead of direct face-to-face interviews is for reasons of feasibility. The couples reside over a large geographical distance that would logistically hinder face-to-face encounters with the interviewer. However, there may be an added advantage to the telephone interview. In the Filipino culture, people tend to try to please the person they respect by giving the answer they think that person

expects. Literature on Filipino culture suggest that face-to-face encounter is often avoided to preserve a smooth interpersonal relationship, and to dodge having to respond to embarrassing requests, questions, complaints, or to make uncomfortable decisions, which can cause “hiya” (shame) (Lynch 1962). Bulatao (1964:428) tentatively defines "hiya" as a painful emotion arising from a relationship with an authority figure or with society, inhibiting self-assertion in a situation, which is perceived as dangerous to one's ego. It is a kind of anxiety, or fear of experiencing one's ego exposed, unprotected and unaccepted.

Thus, the possible skewing, or causing the discomfort of “hiya” (shame) on the participants may be reduced by the distant contact. Added to that, they do not have to tidy up the house, or dress up for the event, and it can be at any time during the day or evening. Consequently, they would be less inconvenienced.

The possible specific impact of the different location of residence on the sample may be left for further study. However, with regard to the Filipina wives, literature confirms that despite the clashes with American values, salient key cultural values that guide Filipino family relations and customs are still part of the heritage and identity of the Filipino population in the United States and in Canada (Santa Rita 1996; Blankston 1999; Agbayani-Siewart 2002).

## **1.9 Delimitation**

### **1.9.1 Delimitation of cultural background**

The topic of intercultural marriage in general is too broad an issue for a study. Each cultural background and cultural configuration of intercultural couples must be examined specifically, considering their particular issues and context. This project focuses on Evangelical couples of Filipinas married with North American Caucasian husbands. However, both in the Philippines and in North America where intermarriage has been prevalent in the nation's history, it is only conceivable to think

in terms of the group of Asian women that belong to the Philippine mainstream culture, and men who grew up in North America, and consider themselves belonging to the North American mainstream Caucasian (White) culture. Racial purity cannot be contemplated by the term Filipina and North American Caucasian, rather how they identify themselves as belonging to the population and cultural grouping. In North America, there is the practice of population categorization such as: Caucasian, African-American, Native-American, Asian, Hispanics, or other. As mentioned earlier, literature associates dominant mainstream North American culture to the White middle-class and upper middle class population (Steward and Bennet 1991; Preli and Bernard 1993; Althen 2003).

It stands to reason that there can be other characteristics of ancestral culture in the Filipina or North American White participants that are not considered in the study. Also, it will be beyond the confines of the present study to research the aspects of the stages of cultural assimilation of the couples to their mainstream culture.

### **1.9.2 The gender choice**

The choice of configuration of Philippine wife and North American husband is based on the consideration that a decisive delimitation is needed, because there may be differences in the adjustment process whether the wife or the husband is the Filipino or the North American. Also, Statistics in the Philippines indicates that the greatest number of marriages between Philippine nationals and foreigners are of Filipinas with North American men (see 1.2.2. Situation in the Philippines).

### **1.9.3 Years of marriage**

The couples are to have been married for at least seven years. A longitudinal study from the stage of newly-weds to the stage of couples' with adolescent children may have been ideal, but not practical for this study due to time constraint. A couple who has been married for at least seven years will have experienced the stresses of marital

life with young children (Booth and White 1980; Olson et al. 1989). Also, studies on intercultural marriage suggest that there are added marital stresses related to childrearing issues with couples of different ethnicity and culture (Markoff 1977; Sung 1990; Forna 1992).

Even a couple that has remained childless for this period of time may have to deal with the stresses of childlessness in their marriage relationship. In the Philippine context having children is highly significant for the marriage (Andres 1987; Andres and Andres 1987; Matthews 1994; Panopio and Rolda 2000).

Thus, the sample is delimited to couples of which the wife is identified as Filipina with a husband who is identified as Caucasian North American, and they must have been married at least for seven years. Their religion is Evangelical, but not limited to a particular Evangelical denomination.

### **1.10 Summary**

The issue of the success of marriages, including intercultural marriages among Evangelical believers is the concern of the Evangelicals as a whole. Prinzing and Prinzing (1991:105,106) remark that the church is “us”. No literature on Evangelical intercultural marriage of Filipinas with North American men has been found, and existing literature for marriage and premarital counseling focus on intracultural marriage. Therefore, the intention of our study is ultimately to contribute to the field of pastoral counseling by providing better understanding and focus in premarital and marital counseling with intercultural couples.

Statistics manifest that the number of intercultural marriages is rising in North America as well as in the Philippines. This trend is also noticeable among the Evangelicals.

Theologically, the Bible does not prohibit intercultural marriage between believers. The NT capitalizes on the idea of unity and universality of believers in Christ. For Evangelicals the Bible is the source for teaching and guidance on principles for marriage. In it the concept of covenant commitment and unconditional sacrificial love are of supreme importance. These principles are a firm basis for enduring marital commitment and for making adjustments in marital relationship.

The support of pastoral and mutual care in the church community which functions as a family of believers can contribute to the well-being of the couples in the congregation. In such a context there is mutual care and acceptance, and there can be accountability and spiritual nurture. These aspects are in agreement with the idea of the general priesthood of believers, mutual paraklesis and koinonia in the church community

Moreover, various studies on marital commitment, and marital adjustment found positive influences of religious orientation, and church participation on marital relationships.

The thesis progresses as follows: Chapter I is Introduction, Chapter II is Literature Review; it comprises of five themes: (1) Literature on intercultural marriage; (2) Literature of Biblical theology on intercultural marriage; (3) Literature of Evangelical perspectives on relevant issues of marriage; (4) Literature on mainstream Philippine and American salient cultural values; and (5) Literature of research on the influence of religious orientation and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment. Chapter III discusses the Fieldwork. Lastly, Chapter IV is Summary and Implication.

## Chapter II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

Much of the literature on interracial marriage deals with Black and White couples. It mostly focuses on treatment of problems. In fact, research literature on multiracial individuals, couples and families has been criticized as being limited by the tendency to perceive multiracial people from the point of view of deficits, their use of small research sample, focusing on clinical populations, and limited age groups (Kenney and Root 1997b; Wehrly et al. 1999:2). By focusing on the Black and White dynamics, the research concludes that all mixed heritage families and individuals are bound to live with irresolvable conflicts and identity confusion (Nakashima 1992).

However, the present study is on Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas married to North American Caucasian husbands. With regard to Filipinas' intermarriage, currently the reputation of mail-order brides leads to a distorted and negative public perception of Filipinas married to foreigners. This is the case, even if they are not mail-order brides (Cahill 1990:134). Literature on international marriage migration is mostly concerned with social ills and abuses involving the mail-order bride's phenomenon. Also, existing studies on Filipina intercultural marriage often alluded to the Roman Catholic religiosity of these women as an important element for their adjustment and staying in the marriage. In our study, attention is directed to the situation of the intermarried Evangelical Filipinas' religiosity.

Distinct from the contributions of other studies on the various intercultural marriages, this study focuses on the marital commitment and adjustment of intercultural couples of Evangelical Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands and how these aspects of their marriage life are influenced by the Biblical teaching they received and by the involvement in their Evangelical churches.

Therefore the literature review will be arranged as follows:

1. Literature on intercultural marriage.
2. Literature of Biblical theology on intercultural marriage.
3. Literature of Evangelical perspectives on relevant issues of marriage.
4. Literature on mainstream Philippine and American salient cultural values.
5. Literature of research on the influence of religious orientation and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment.

## **2.1 Literature on intercultural Marriage**

The literature review on intercultural marriage will begin by clarifying how the terminology is defined in research literature, and then the discussion of the various categories of literature on intercultural marriage will follow.

### **2.1.1 Definition of terms**

Literature on intercultural marriage includes "interracial", "interethnic", "interreligion" and "international" marriages. A distinct type of international marriage is the international marriage migration. The topics of "interracial", "interethnic", and "interreligion" have overlapping elements that are intercultural.

Jones and Chao (1977:158) state that the terms ethnicity, race, and culture have been inconsistently and sometimes interchangeably used in clinical literature.

Mc Goldrick, Pearce and Giordano (1982:4) define ethnicity as a sense of commonality transmitted over generations by the family and reinforced by the surrounding community. It is more than race, religion or national and geographic origin. It involves conscious and unconscious processes that fulfill a deep psychological need for identity and historical continuity. This view is congruent with Shibutani and Kwan (1965:23). They associate ethnicity with those who conceive

themselves as alike by virtue of their common ancestry, real or fictitious, and how other people regard them.

On the other hand, race is defined as a set of phenotypical markers by which people are categorized by the society. Thus, physical features are the defining markers. However, racial categorization can be influenced strongly by social and power issues. It follows that a person of "mixed race" can be assigned to one or another racial category that does not accurately reflect their biological heritage (Russel et al. 1992; Camper 1994; Root 1992, 1995; Chao 1995b). For example, until recently the "one drop" rule was applied to North Americans with any trace of black heritage, regardless how remote the biological connection was (Russel et al. 1992, in Jones and Chao 1997:159).

The Compact Oxford English Dictionary (2005, 3rd. ed.) presents the following possible meanings for "race": (1) each of the major divisions of humankind, having distinct physical characteristics, (2) racial origin or distinction in the sense of rights based on race, (3) a group of people sharing the same culture, language etc. (an ethnic group), (4) a group of people or things with a common feature, (5) biologically a distinct population within a species (subspecies). The dictionary also adds that some people currently feel that the word race should be avoided. The reason is that it is associated with the now discredited theories of 19th-century anthropologists and physiologists who assigned supposed racial superiority to certain groups. The dictionary suggests that terms such as people, community, or ethnic group are less emotionally charged.

It is noteworthy that, in order to distinguish the Philippine and the North American mainstream cultural values, this study delimits the participants to "Caucasian" North Americans for the husband's group. Literature expresses that the "mainstream" or "dominant" culture in North America is generally associated with the white middle-class and upper middle class North Americans of European decent (Steward and Bennet 1991; Bernard and Preli 1993; Althen 2003). Thus, the emphasis is on the

cultural distinctive, and no racial purity is contemplated in the terminology of “Caucasian”.

With regards to culture, Falicov (1988:336) defines it as those sets of shared worldviews and adaptive behaviors derived from simultaneous membership in a variety of contexts. Falicov proposes the following elements as examples: ecological setting (rural, urban, suburban), religious background, nationality and ethnicity, gender related experience, occupation, values of generation, and so forth.

However, Berger and Hill (1998:7) perceive the perplexities of what constitutes a different culture as something that is closer to "home". They point out that a cultural divide can be between the sexes within the same class of society and culture. Thus, Berger and Hill propose that all marriages can be said to be cross-cultural in some way.

Similarly, Falicov (1995:231) pointedly states that intercultural marriage is unavoidable, even if we marry the boy next door. The fact that people marry a different gender can introduce considerable differences in worldviews and experiences.

Thus, Berger and Hill and Falicov's propositions would resonate with the idea that to work at adjustment in marriage is more important than compatibility (Gottman 1994:23). This may be true for intra-cultural or intercultural couples.

Earlier writing (Barth 1969) refers to culture as those elements that are relevant to communication across some kind of social boundary. One is born into one's ethnicity but one can move in and out of cultural contexts. This author refers here to such examples as patriarchal culture, majority or minority culture, street culture and so forth. It may be added that there can also be an Evangelical culture.

In relation to interracial and intercultural marriage, O'Neal, Brown and Abadie (1997) submit that generally interracial marriage involves marital partners who are of different racial groups, marked by different physical characteristics. Interracial marriage is a subset of interethnic marriage, in which the partners are of different cultural backgrounds.

Maretzki (1977:1-2) proposes a similar but more expanded concept on intermarriage. He views intercultural marriage as a marriage that takes place between spouses of different cultural backgrounds. There are differences in their values, beliefs, customs, traditions or lifestyle. These cultural dimensions are relatively significant aspects of such marriages. On the other hand, interracial marriage refers to differences in biological terms. Hence, visible hereditary elements are present. He concludes that a basis for the popular concept of race is significant ancestry and culture. These combinations of factors have in recent years been known as "ethnicity". While "intercultural" is in essence a broader term and almost inescapable in one way or another, "interracial" is more specific and physically visible. Maretzki maintained that usually interracial marriages cause more tension and controversy than intercultural or interethnic relationships.

However, Prinzing and Prinzing (1991:11) posit that though "intercultural" is more inclusive, it may or may not involve people of different races. It is possible to marry interracially and at the same time not interculturally and also vice versa. Nonetheless, Spickard (1989) states that interracial or interethnic marriages basically deal with the same issues.

With regards to Falicov (1988:336) and Maretzki (1977:1-2), interreligion or interfaith marriages would also be included in intercultural marriages as these imply the differences in world views, beliefs, values, customs and rituals, as well as lifestyle. Gordon (1966:1) used the term "mixed marriage" for interfaith or interreligion. He stated:

*If prior to or following the marriage, the parties continue to identify with their separate religions, they are not only intermarried but are parties to a "mixed marriage" as well. If both parties formally accept the same religion even though they are intermarried, they are nevertheless of the same religious persuasion and hence no longer "mixed".*

Thus, as Barth (1969) mentions earlier referring to culture, it is possible to “move in and out” of religion. This would be impossible with race. At the same time, interfaith marriage in itself is drastically intercultural when both parties strongly identify with their own religion. The problems of marrying interracially and interethnically can be compounded, if concurrently it is also an interfaith marriage.

Further, beyond the borders of a country, Cottrell (1990:152) categorizes intermarriage as "cross-national". She describes cross-national marriages as most likely interethnic marriages but they differ in two ways. First, the partners usually continue to maintain ties, often including citizenship in both nations. The second possibility is that the couple may live in a third country where both are foreigners.

The author proposes that equating cross-national with cross-cultural is overly simplistic. The reasons being that most nations are ethnically diverse. One cannot assume that cross-national marriages will necessarily involve very different cultures even if the dominant cultures in the two nations are very different. As example, she mentioned that in India, there is a range of cultural patterns from very traditional through modern to Western. Thus, an Indian who is an urban Westernized Christian will have fewer cultural differences married to an American Christian than one married to an Indian who is an orthodox Hindu.

While it is true that there can be a greater affinity between the urbanized Westernized Christian of a country like India with Western urbanized Christians of America, it is difficult to concede that an international marriage of this kind is not an intercultural marriage.

On the other extreme, earlier Berger and Hill (1998:7) point out that all marriages can be said to be cross-cultural in some way. Similarly, Falicov (1995:231) writes that even marrying the boy next-door or different gender would involve different worldviews; and it would be intercultural too.

Furthermore, Mc Goldrick (1982) and Herr (1987, in Preli and Bernard 1993:8) are of the opinion that in the American context, ethnic traditions may still continue to be influential in a person's life and behavior until the 3rd and 4th generation. It would be a topic for further research, to find out how long cultural traditions continue to be influential after a person has become westernized, or has converted to the Christian faith. However, belonging to a certain social class, being urbanized, well educated and Christian can also constitute a distinct culture. This is congruent with Falicov's definition (1988:366) mentioned earlier.

In short, "interracial", "interethnic", "interreligion" ("interfaith") or "international" marriages involve intercultural marriage. A specific subset of international marriage is the phenomenon of international marriage migration. This is a cross-national marriage especially between women of poorer countries with men from richer countries, often arranged through profit matchmaking agencies. Simmons (2001) repeatedly uses the words "international matchmaking industry" in her study. Thus, this phenomenon is compared to a market situation, where there are elements of offer, demands and brokers. Also the term "international marriage market" is used in this context in Simmons (2001) and Jones (2001).

Although this topic does not directly relate to this study, the literature on the mail-order brides cannot be ignored. The Philippines is the major sending country of "foreign brides" (Simmons 2001). This literature provides some insights concerning the background for out-marriage of Filipinas, though most do not use the mail-order avenue. Moreover, many Filipinas who intermarry suffer the rejection of society because of the publicized reputation of the mail-order brides (Cahill 1990).

In conclusion, in literature "interracial", "interethnic", and "intercultural" are often used interchangeably. "Interracial", "interethnic", "interfaith" ("interreligion") as well as "international" marriages have intercultural elements in them. If even marrying the "boy next door" or a person of another gender involves crossing a cultural gap, the question remains how large and how deep must be the gap to be called "intercultural marriage"? Thus, in agreement with Gottman (1994), indeed there could be little chance for perfect compatibility with any marriage couple, and adjustment and commitment in marriage could be relevant factors for any marriage.

For our purposes, the terms "interracial", "interethnic", "interfaith" ("interreligion"), and "international" ("cross-national") marriage will be considered as subsets of "intercultural" marriage. The topic of the thesis is on intercultural marriage of Filipinas with Evangelical Caucasian North-Americans. Therefore, it concerns intercultural marriage in the sense of being interracial and international or cross-national marriage but not interfaith or interreligion.

### **2.1.2 Literature category according to emphasis**

The discussion of literature on intercultural marriage will be broadly categorized according to the authors' main interest in the topic: (1) theory and trends, (2) applied research, (3) clinical treatment of problems; (4) international marriage migration, and (5) intercultural marriage between persons from certain groups (e.g. Filipinas married to North Americans, Filipinas married to Dutch and Germans, and Filipinas married to Japanese).

Among the literature in the category of theory and trends are for instance, Gordon (1966), Baron (1972), Cerroni-Long (1984), Ortega, et al. (1988), Cottrell (1990), Chan and Smith (1995), Root (1996), Sollors (2000), and Berger and Hill (1998).

Examples of the literature of applied research are: Prinzing and Prinzing (1991), Johnson and Warren (1994), Crohn (1995), and Romano (2001).

The third group refers to clinical treatment of the problems in intercultural marriage. Some examples are Char (1977), Markoff (1977), Marezki (1977), Mc Goldrick, Giordano, and Pearce (1982, 1996), Mc Goldrick and Preto (1984), Falicov (1995), Jones and Chao (1997).

The fourth group emphasizes the International Marriage Migration phenomenon. This is apparent in studies such as, Simmons (2001), and Ordoñez (1997). Portes and Rumbaut (1996), del Rosario, (1994), Julag'ay (1997), and Ordoñez (1997).

Among the literature that focuses on intermarriage between persons of certain groups, the review will discuss the publications on Filipinas married to foreign men by Rafel 1954, Hunt and Coller 1957, Buttny 1989, Samonte 1992, Samonte 1994, Beer 1996, and Bauzon 1999.

#### 2.1.2.1 Theory and trends

Gordon (1966) publishes a comprehensive book on intercultural marriage. He includes extensive important data of his time on interracial, interethnic and interreligious (interdenominational) marriage in America. He proposes that the equalization of education and economic status among people of various religious, ethnic and racial groups increases the likelihood of intermarriage. Gordon refutes the views, which present the intermarried person as deviant or rebellious against parents. In his view, intermarriage is rather the product of urbanization, mobility, propinquity and other significant factors in society (Gordon 1966:54).

Although he rejects racism, he believes that intermarriage constitutes a threat to society and it is not a promise for a brighter future (1966:368). The author particularly opposes interfaith unions. He expresses that having been in active Rabbinate for 35 years has caused him to be concerned with divorce, separation and

annulment resulting from interfaith marriages. Therefore, Gordon believes that one preventive measure against interfaith marriages would be by establishing religious schools (1966:350). In this regard, he seems to resonate with Bob Jones, the founder of Bob Jones University. The latter will be mentioned further in the section on literature of Biblical theology on intercultural marriage. It is sufficient to add here that Jones' segregational view was mainly based on his conviction concerning racial distinction, whereas Gordon's was about religious differences. Nonetheless, both Gordon and Jones, express their segregation's view out of concern, because they believe that intercultural marriages will fail.

Baron (1972) edits a comprehensive book on intercultural marriage. In his book, he states that the typical American college population of his time is ethnically mixed. Similar to Gordon, he perceives that there is considerably less assurance that the young men and women, who will meet in class, will not intermarry, because they will fall in love. In his publication he intends to show a representative sampling and coordination of the social scientific, particularly sociological, literature on intermarriage in America. Baron perceives intercultural marriage as a trend. Both Gordon's view of intermarriage as the product of urbanization, mobility, and propinquity (1966), as well as Baron's description of the rising trend of intermarriage (1972) are applicable in the context of the present study on Evangelical intercultural marriage.

In contrast, Cerroni-Long (1984) is more concerned with isolating the socio-cultural and psychological elements, which play a part in intermarriage, rather than with presenting concrete examples or statistical figures. She discusses the characteristics of endogamous and exogamous societies, typology of marriage, and the stress factors in intermarriage.

The author attempts to find answers to questions such as: Why do people marry with someone outside of their group? What kind of people practice exogamy most, and whom do they choose as partner? How do intermarried couples fare in terms of

duration of marriage? Also, she analyzes the possible sources of stress and difficulties that intermarried spouses are to overcome in order to succeed in marriage.

With regard to the increase in out-marriages, she submits that several factors seem to lead directly to a decrease in preoccupation with endogamous rules. These are that women increasingly acquire power of choice in their own right, the general tendency toward egalitarianism and secularism, the growing rejection of external pressure on personal choice, the decreasing preoccupation with procreation and the consequence of more conjugal-centered unions. Thus, the Filipinas who intermarry are not the typical persons who abide by the conventional marital tradition in their society, but those, who pursue personal choices. However, secularism is not proven in the Filipina group. Studies report of their religiosity.

Further, on the issue of homogamy, Ortega, et al. (1988) state that Americans tend to marry endogamously with respect to social and cultural characteristics. Some of this is influenced by demographic factors and geographic propinquity, but group values and norms promote homogamy and discourage heterogamy. They indicate that constraints regarding interracial marriage appear to be the strongest, followed respectively by religious factors, social class and ethnicity.

They find that one of the important underlying assumptions for encouraging marital homogamy is the belief that persons sharing similar characteristics, such as social status, values, norms, and beliefs, would adjust more easily to one another. In other words, socio-cultural homogamy would promote harmony, whereas heterogamy would increase the chances of discord and unhappiness. The authors are referring here to the study of Crombs (1966), Murstein (1977), and Reiss (1980). Ortega et al. (1988) affirm that sociological and social-psychological theories of love and mate selection are generally consistent with this proposition.

Although, the basic assumptions pro homogamy still exist, Baron (1972) and Cerroni-Long (1984), and later Root (1996) and others, point to the social trends of

liberalization from endogamy. Statistics show that this is a fact. The views of intermarriage as a product of urbanization, mobility, and propinquity and other social factors such as the freedom for choice of mate and egalitarianism (Gordon 1966:54; Cerroni-Long 1984) seem to be a reality. Thus, the constraints of group values and norms against out-marriage are breaking down.

Beyond the American scene, Cottrell's work (1990) distinguishes itself from the others in that it is a review of thirty-three studies on cross-national marriage published since the 1950s. This review identifies three different types of cross-national marriage, each with a dominant theme: "War Bride" or "colonizer" couples, Educated Western-Non Western (third world) couples, and Western-Western (near cultures) couples. Two early publications on Filipina-American marriage are included in this review, namely Rafel (1954) and Hunt and Coller (1957). These two are classified as "War Bride" research.

Cottrell concludes that the lives of cross-national couples generally reflect the culture of the country in which they reside, unless there is a strong commitment to the foreign partner's culture, usually because of religion. She also summarizes that cultural differences were reported as not the source of conflict per se. The conflicts reflected personal social attitudes toward differences. Thus, it is not necessarily true that the greater the cultural differences, the greater the conflict. However, she admits that the body of literature reviewed falls short of representing the global phenomenon of cross-national marriage. Moreover, further research and revisions will be needed to provide a more realistic understanding of issues and additional information from new research.

Similar to Cottrell's view (1990), Chan and Smith (1995) find that the stability, satisfaction or marital conflicts of intermarried couples are not caused by the fact of their race or ethnicity per se. Attitudes to race and culture of the marital partners and the potential conflictive relationship with in-laws and the perceptions of society can lower marital stability and satisfaction of these couples. Chan and Smith (1995) also

maintain that speculation on the well-being and marital stability of such marriages is mostly negative, though this assumption has not been tested empirically.

Root (1996) is a biracial person herself and was born in the Philippines (1996:XIII). Unlike Ortega et al. (1988), she is optimistic of the course of acceptance of the American society towards intermarriage and multiracial people. Her writing includes statistical data of demographic trends and historical legislative events in the United States during the 20th century that were significant in the process of removal of segregation and the increase of racial mixing.

She refers to the U. S. Bureau of Census 1992 which forecasted that by the year 2050, the representative face of America would no longer be white. For the first time in history, the number of biracial babies is increasing at a faster rate than the number of monoracial babies. She mentions that by 1991 more Americans approved (48%) than disapproved (42%) of interracial marriage (Gallup Poll 1991). Also, there is a more favorable attitude among Whites toward interracial marriage. U. S. Census Bureau figures confirmed that attitude changes have translated into demographic changes. The rate of interracial marriages has nearly doubled each decade since 1970. Across racial groups, approval of intermarriage is associated with higher levels of education, living in large cities, higher incomes, living outside the South, more liberal ideology and being younger than 50 years (Root 1996:XIV, XVI).

Root's optimism partly agrees with Sollors' book (2000). Sollors deliberates the history of the legal struggle in the United States against anti-miscegenation laws. It reflects the big step of progress that has been made by the disappearance of such laws. Nonetheless, Sollors is careful to add that today the majority of both Blacks and Whites oppose interracial marriage because of social considerations. Referring to Black and White intermarriage, he states that the number of interracial marriages do seem to be increasing but even those who approve in principles will find it difficult to advise their sons or daughters to enter into such a marriage, knowing the unavoidable social problems which confront an interracial couple (Sollors 2000:60).

Sollors only highlights the Black and White intermarriage situation, perhaps because this case is legally and socially the most serious. However, other races, “Mongolian, American Indian, Asiatic Indian, Malay, or any mixture thereof, or any other non-caucasian strains”, were implicated in the legal prohibition to intermarry with Caucasian Americans ("Act to Preserve Racial Integrity" of 1924, in Sollors 2000:23-26).

On the other hand, Root perceives the concern of the last quarter of the 20th century as dealing mainly with the societal interpretations and adjustments in the attempt towards a deeper structural change. The contributors of her book aim at opening a dialogue directed to a deeper level of change. Their intention is to make the borders between races more permeable. Issues for dialogue are human rights, identity formation, flexibility and blending of multiple statuses and identities, multicultural education and race relations in America. Thus, Root and her contributing authors do not deal directly with the topic of intercultural marriage but with the wider framework of multiculturalism in the context of society.

Distinct from Root (1996) who wrote on the American social context, Berger and Hill (1998) were less optimistic about the European context. This literature describes some examples of the signs of persistence of racism in Europe. The authors maintain that currently, in Great Britain, interracial couples and their children need daily courage to face some form or other of racism and discrimination. This is not only from the White majority, but also from the minority groups, such as Blacks, Indians, and Chinese in Britain. Thus, this suggests that where the intercultural couples reside may make a difference to their acceptance in society.

#### 2.1.2.2 Applied research

This group of literature on intercultural marriage is intended to include the general public, who may benefit from the application of research on this subject in dealing

with their own intermarried circumstances. Examples from this group are Prinzing and Prinzing (1991), Johnson and Warren (1994), Crohn (1995) and Romano (2001).

Prinzing and Prinzing (1991) wrote from their own experience in dealing with their children's Black-White interracial marriage. Besides, they interviewed more than one hundred people who were directly or indirectly involved with interracial marriage, and they also did literature research. Although their book addresses the issue of Black and White marriage, the focus is on racism in the social context. The authors suggest that the trends indicate that relatively few families will be able to avoid the issue of interracial and intercultural dating or marriage in the coming decade. They underline that Christians need to deal with this issue of interracial or intercultural marriage, which occurs among Christians. Evangelical churches have largely remained silent on the issue of racism. When they have spoken, the messages were mixed. Although the Evangelical denominations have given token and theoretical support to interracial and intercultural marriages, many church families transmit different messages (Prinzing and Prinzing 1991:105).

One outstanding feature of this publication is that it is written from an Evangelical Christian perspective and addressing Evangelical Christians as their main audience on the topic of racism. In addition, they attempt to offer to prospective Evangelical Christians, who are contemplating intermarriage, practical guidelines whether to proceed, to delay, or to stay away from interracial or intercultural marriage.

Johnson and Warren (1994) took a different point of departure and approach from Prinzing and Prinzing. They were motivated by their own awareness of the increase in the number of mixed marriages and their intention was to inform themselves and others about the experience of intermarriage. This book discusses historical facts, literary motifs and images on intermarriage involving various races and cultures and testimonies of intermarried couples. The contributing couples present an account of the advantages and constraints of their own situation as mixed couples and their children.

Johnson and Warren point out that marriage is more than a relationship between individuals. It is a relationship between groups. It signifies equality between the groups. The recognition and acceptance of this fact can be a struggle. (Johnson and Warren 1994:1).

Crohn (1995) contributes with his rich experience from clinical practice in dealing with mixed marriages. Although this literature touches various intercultural issues, it is specifically focused on interfaith marriages. The author expresses that although unrecognized differences often cause distress, insight is no guarantee of happiness. Acceptance, appreciation and the desire to make the relationship work are necessary. Crohn also asserts that learning and dealing with differences is a lifelong process and it takes work. (Crohn 1995:41). Thus, whether for conventional marriage (Gottman 1994) or mixed marriage, commitment to work on the process of adjustment is a relevant factor.

In addition, Crohn intends to guide the readers in finding ways for overcoming the hurdles in their marriage relationship. Consequently, he includes examples and exercises to facilitate the understanding of differences between the spouses in mixed-marriage situations and to help them bridge the gaps.

Romano (2001) expresses that, in the second edition of her book, she has changed her perspective somewhat from the first one. She has become more positive about intercultural marriages. Romano has not only interviewed hundreds of intercultural couples, but she has also followed them up for nearly a decade. She believes now, that these marriages could be a sure path to self-knowledge and growth (Romano 2001:IX).

In this publication, the author discusses among other issues, three phases of adjustment in intercultural marriage, the struggles and the process of adjustment as the couples deal with the pressures from society and the transitions of their life cycle.

She brings out specific issues such as raising bicultural children, coping with death or divorce, differences in values and sex roles, and so forth.

She remarks that the "dream couples" are those who know and accept that marriage is a lifetime negotiation. It is a process (Romano 2001:30). This assessment agrees with Crohn's (1995:41). Romano ends with a paragraph affirming that intercultural couples have chosen a complicated route in life, "one which takes more work, more time, more empathy, more honesty, more everything". However, they also will have an advantage, if they realize this beforehand and they are ready to give whatever it takes to make their marriage succeed. In the end these couples will have the possibility of gaining more than couples who do not dare to be different (Romano 2001:213). The gain is personal growth and self-knowledge (Romano 2001:IX).

In short, generally the world's population has become more urbanized and more mobile. Transport and communication methods also facilitate different peoples to be more connected. This situation seems to be conducive to producing an increase in intermarriage (Gordon 1966). Gordon (1966), Baron (1972) as well as Root (1996) point out the growing trends toward intercultural marriage. Also, more individuals have the right to personally choose their mate and more women have acquired an egalitarian view of marriage. Those factors are influential in decreasing the constraints of group values and norms that prohibit intermarriage (Cerroni-Long 1984; Ortega et al. 1988). The incidents of intercultural marriage are also happening among Evangelicals. However, Evangelicals have not yet clearly addressed this issue (Prinzing and Prinzing 1991).

Nevertheless, the fact that intercultural marriages have become more common and more accepted in the American society does not eliminate the stresses of cultural differences in an intercultural marriage situation. Negative assumptions, that such differences cause marital discord, persist. In addition, marital adjustment is a lifelong process that takes commitment (Crohn 1995; Romano 2001). Attitude changes toward the differences among all the people involved, the spouses, the in-laws, and

the surrounding network are important to strengthen the couples' marital stability and satisfaction (Cottrell 1990; Prinzing and Prinzing 1991; Johnson and Warren 1994; Chan and Smith 1995).

The present study attempts to clarify the facts that have not been discussed in the previously mentioned literature, namely, the effects of Biblical teaching and church participation on Evangelical Filipina - North American Caucasian couples. Would such teaching and church community provide a common ground for the parties involved, particularly for the couples' marital commitment and adjustment, and the development of open and benign attitudes as they work on the differences?

#### 2.1.2.3 Clinical treatment of problems

This type of literature focuses on treatment of problems in intercultural marriages. It is written for intercultural marriage counselors. This literature often explores the issues of motivations for intermarriage, the prospect for adjustment, strategies for treating conflicts in intermarried couples' relationship and also their children's problems associated with the intercultural situation and the training of the marriage therapists. These studies often present well-researched information, which are useful for possible cues in investigating the issues of adjustment and commitment of Evangelical Filipina - North American couples and the impact of their participation in an Evangelical church community.

Tseng and Mc Dermott (1977) edited a collection of articles, which deal with adjustment issues of intercultural marriages in Hawaii. About 50 percent of the marriages in Hawaii were intercultural in nature (Char 1977:30). In Hawaii the increase of marriages between individuals who grew up in families of divergent traditions and identification has made intercultural marriage an accepted practice (Maretzki 1977:8). However, they still have problems. Four of the contributors of this publication are Char, Markoff, Maretzki and Tseng. They each treat a different topic of intercultural marriage.

Char (1977) discusses motivation for intercultural marriage. He states that the motivation is often the result of a combination of several factors, which can be conscious or unconscious. It can be out of love. He asserts that love is important; it must be the "glue" in marriage. He does not elaborate about the kind of love. Beside love, the motivation can be propinquity and availability, the need to be different or the need for adventure, practical reasons (i.e. financial security, or social status), negative feelings of parents transferred to the relationship with the opposite sex, messages from parents who are dissatisfied with his/her spouse of the same culture, and stereotypical beliefs about one's own and other's cultures. Also mentioned are feelings of inferiority, acts of aggression toward another race, idealism, and even sadomasochistic reasons. These motives do not reflect much of a positive sense of psychological health.

Further, Char concludes that there can be two extreme views. One is to see intercultural marriages as an idealistic progressive form of human relationship. In this case prejudices and biases are broken down and the partners are regarded as strong, courageous and idealistic. The other extreme is to see most intercultural marriages as basically unwholesome and those who take part in them as unwise or maladjusted. Depending on how one feels for intercultural marriages, one will tend to see the motivations for intercultural marriages as positive or negative (Char 1977:39).

Thus, Char's conclusion can mean that therapists need to check their subjective inclination in this matter. Moreover, it may mean that all of us probably succumb to this tendency to be swayed by how we feel about intercultural marriage, in judging the motivations for such a relationship positively or negatively.

Markoff (1977) is more concerned with the issues of communication and social context. He points out that non-verbal elements are of greater significance in these relationships than in conventional marriages. Also, differences in value system are important factors. Frequently, an acceptance of the validity of contrary value systems

remains simply intellectual, while on the feeling level one's own value system still seems "best" (Markoff 1977:55).

The concept of marriage can differ widely from culture to culture. Each culture delineates the aims and objective of marriage by means of a set of values, which includes such issues as the model for marital relationship, the nature of sexual relationship, the manner in which children shall be reared, the divisions of responsibility, the nature of love as it applies to marriage, and the kind of marital partner to select.

Another problem area is the autonomous behavior and practice. There are cultural practices which may once have had clear relationship to particular necessities but which currently have lost that relevance. Thus, there are particular solutions to common problems, which persist unchallenged, though presently there are more feasible and even more advantageous alternatives. Autonomous practices are these customs and practices that have no clear contemporary relationship to higher values or to necessities. Such practices can become issues in intercultural marriages.

Furthermore, prejudices and stereotypes create problems when partners do not perceive each other as an individual but as the representative of his/her culture or ethnic group. The partner is expected to fulfill unrealistic stereotypical expectations.

Moreover, the families surrounding the intercultural couples may bring many stresses to the marriage. These are parents, grandparents, siblings, uncles, aunts, cousins and so forth. Added to that, children's issues can make value conflicts pronounced. Different views on the education of children, the arrangements for their physical welfare and the interference of the two sets of parents can make matters worse. Not only the conflict within the family and the adjustment of the children can bring problems, also the surrounding society may negatively affect the adjustment of the children.

Added to that, if the society does not accept a particular intercultural marriage, there can be barriers in terms of housing, employments and so forth. Thus, all the personal qualities and attitudes that militate toward success in any marriage, such as tolerance for diversity, and a positive orientation toward changes and flexibility, may be tested to their utmost in the intercultural marriage (Markoff 1977:61). This would imply that there must be a sufficiently supportive and accepting community in which the intercultural couples can feel at home. In our thesis, church participation will be considered, because of its potential for a fellowship of like-minded people, mutual edification and support in meeting much of the emotional and spiritual needs of the couples.

Maretzki (1977) stresses the need for specialists and for special approaches in dealing with intercultural marriage problems. He introduces some significant questions: If intercultural marriage is not conventional, is it deviant? If deviant, are there risks in such a marriage for which preventive and interventive clinical approaches have been developed? The contributors of the book attempt to clarify these issues.

Maretzki believes that generally, marriages are most common between partners who are chosen from more similar rather than different social and other characteristics. As the significance of kinship and family fades and as cultural rules in other aspects weaken, marriages become more and more individualized. The author perceives intercultural marriage as one outcome of diminishing stringent cultural rules about appropriate mate selection (Maretzki 1977:6).

Further, he maintains that intercultural marriage is one example of change. Where it occurs, it has been and still is considered to be a deviant form of marriage. However, as with other cultural deviance that has gradually become accepted because it is so common, some day this too will be the case with intercultural marriage. Acceptance is only one step to regularity. There are implications or consequences to intercultural marriage for spouses and offspring, which ultimately come to the attention of clinicians. He adds that even marriages between individuals of quite similar

backgrounds have problems, but the problems of intercultural marriages are unique, although not necessarily more serious than those of conventional couples.

Therefore, in modern society with its broad contacts of people and opportunities for intermarriage, there is a need for specialists and for special approaches. Here, he refers to Pederson (1976) whose book describes clinical remedies the contributors had found useful. Marezki believes that in addition to more conventional clinical skills, the clinicians must have the ability to identify and include cultural dimensions such as, rules of behavior, values and beliefs. Hence, a good part of therapeutic efforts may deal as much with an interpretation of the cultural differences of a couple, as with their problems (Marezki 1977:10-11).

Tseng (1977) contributed from an Asian perspective to the book. His article is on adjustment in intercultural marriage. He stresses working together in making adjustment toward a common goal as the primary factor for successful intercultural marriage. He proposes several factors, which are necessary for successful adjustment in marriage.

Although the concept of marriage may vary in different societies and times, the elemental nature of marriage is that a man and a woman, who are fond of each other, decide to live together for the mutual goal of forming a family to stabilize and improve the quality of their life. In this regard, Tseng's proposition implies a healthy individual choice of a mate. To the contrary, there are parents or families who arrange the marriage. There are also marriages that are purely based on financial security, convenience or even psychopathology (Char 1977).

Tseng (1977) elaborates that sometimes people marry for reasons, such as, to escape from their original homes, or simply for material benefits, to gratify resentments, for a ticket to leave the country, and so forth. These kinds of marriages do not only happen in intercultural relationships, but they are also true in some conventional marriages. The wrong motivations are likely to create conflicts.

Generally, a high tolerance for confusion, an acceptance of areas of dissatisfaction and acknowledgement of how to appropriately change one's attitude according to the situations are important. These qualities are essential for any kind of marriage, but even more so in intercultural marriages. Further, sensitivity to the other's needs, mutual respect and "fairness" for the relationship are necessary too. He also mentioned the acceptance of the community and the support of both sides of the family and a temporary "vacation" to return to one's own lifestyle as very useful for the process of adjustment. However, it is most important that they share a common goal toward which they are strongly motivated (Tseng 1977:102-103).

Like Tseng and Mc Dermott (1977), Mc Goldrick and Preto (1984) are aware of the increasing rate of intermarriage and that the difficulties inherent in intermarriage must be identified and anticipated. In their paper, Mc Goldrick and Preto presented a paradigm for understanding the family patterns and typical problems of ethnic American intermarried couples. They offer suggestions for clinical intervention. They acknowledge the pernicious negative stereotyping in the American culture and state their unwillingness to contribute more to that tendency. However, the focus of this literature is on treatment of problems. Thus, the discussion is basically on the negative rather than on the positive.

The authors assert that intermarriage affects every level of a system: the individual, the married couple, their children, the ethnic group involved and the society as a whole. The greater the cultural differences between the spouses, the more difficulty they will have in understanding each other and in adjusting to the marriage. The families will also have more difficulty in adjusting to the required changes.

Unlike Cottrell (1990), and Chan and Smith (1995) mentioned previously, Mc Goldrick and Preto (1984) are focused on dealing with the problems caused by divergent family patterns. In her review of 33 studies on intercultural marriage, Cottrell states that cultural differences were not reported as the source of conflict per

se. The conflicts reflect personal attitudes toward differences. Chan and Smith (1995) found that the stability, satisfaction and marital conflicts of intermarried couples were not caused by the fact of their race or ethnicity per se. However, the attitudes to race and culture of the marital partners, the potentially conflictive relationship with in-laws, and the perceptions of society can lower these couples' marital stability and satisfaction.

Mc Goldrick and Preto (1984) presented significant information for the understanding and treatment of interethnic couples' adjustment, such as differences in attitudes toward marriage, male and female roles, patterns of emotional expression and communication, and the influence of the life cycle. They maintained that the greater the differences between the spouses, the greater are the difficulties for adjustment; also the less common is the pairing. These issues of concern are useful for consideration in the study of the Evangelical Filipina-North American Caucasian couples.

The issue of pairing among similar persons seems to be congruent with the study by Byrne (1971). Byrne found that husbands and wives tend to marry persons similar to themselves. Thus, it means that even in cross-cultural marriages, despite the differences there can be significant similarities between partners that attract them to each other.

In the second edition of their 1982 publication, Mc Goldrick, Giordano, and Pearce (1996) expand the range of cultural influences and problems in interethnic marriages in America, which can be encountered in clinical practice today. This edition added 23 ethnic groups for discussion. For this reason, this book is useful for clinicians in dealing with different American ethnic configurations in intermarriage.

The writers stress how gender, class, race, religion and politics influence families in adapting to American life. They are convinced that learning about culture is not primarily achieved by learning "facts" of another person's culture, but by changing

one's own attitude. Our underlying openness to those who are culturally different is the key to expanding our cultural understanding (Mc Goldrick, Giordano, Pearce 1996:XI). Therapy frequently involves helping couples understand and negotiate their differences in a cultural context. However, there are certain differences in values, emotional reaction, and worldview that may never be bridged. They point out that it is also important to acknowledge these gaps (Mc Goldrick and Preto 1984:362).

More specifically, Falicov (1995) promotes therapists who can maintain a balanced view of cultural differences. She perceives the therapist's role as a cultural mediator or interpreter of values. She states that couples in distress usually have an impoverished, unbalanced or distorted view of their cultural similarities and differences. In order for spouses to be able to negotiate conflictive areas of cultural differences, they need to arrive at a balanced, adaptive and flexible view of cultural similarities and differences. They either maximize or selectively highlight the differences, or they minimize and selectively submerge them (Falicov 1995:245).

She concedes that the factors that make for success and failure, happiness or unhappiness in a marriage are extremely complex and they cannot be merely reduced to degrees of cultural commonalities or differences. Because of the enormous complexity and variety of cross-cultural marriages, generalization will not be useful for clinicians. Further investigation into the attendant family processes will be necessary. Thus, her article explores the conditions under which cultural differences interact with family processes.

Furthermore, Falicov (1995:237) presents a guideline, which can be useful for therapists in creating a balance in the intercultural marriage interaction, when the spouses minimize or maximize their cultural differences. She offers three possibilities for pitfalls in dealing with conflicts in cultural codes as the therapist assumes the role of cultural mediator or interpreter. The first pitfall is that a cultural clarifier is insufficient or problematic. Thus, the discussion remains at content level,

whereas the therapist must address structural changes in the marital relationship. The second pitfall occurs when the therapist, by raising consciousness about cultural differences, unwittingly communicates hopelessness about the possibility of change. In fact, cultural traits must be viewed as a resource rather than as inflexible feature. The third pitfall is when the therapist brings about marital disengagement by emphasizing the gap in cultural differences too strongly. This could be used to support justification for incompatibility.

To avoid the pitfalls, the conversation can be directed to finding connections, common ideologies, or cultural complementaries, or bridges. Using the label "cultural transition" can encourage spouses to promote the continuity of some of each spouse's traditions, while developing a "new culture" that is more personal, unique and encompassing.

Falicov (1995) suggests important pointers that need to be heeded in doing the personal interview with the participating couples in our study. Although it is an inquiry and not meant to be a therapy session, the personal interview must not minimize or maximize cultural differences and leave the partners with denial or with a hopeless sense of a gap between them.

Unlike Falicov (1995), who proposes that distressed intermarried couples have an unbalanced view of their differences, Jones and Chao (1997) discuss common barriers and impediments to healthy relationships. They intend to provide a helpful orientation guide for clinicians to specific cultural aspects of the practice with intercultural couples.

Jones and Chao maintained that ethnic and cultural dynamics have the potential for enriching intimate relationships. At the same time, there are many ways in which these elements can create serious problems for couples. This is true when they are unaware and unprepared for the implications of those dynamics. Therefore, the authors propose three common problems: (1) discrepant levels and kinds of ethnic

identifications, (2) ignorance or denial in one or both partners of the impact of cultural differences and external oppression, and (3) discrepant ideas about coping with external oppression (Jones and Chao 1997:160).

They believe that critical factors in the development of healthy relationships are: (1) conscious awareness by both partners of the role of culture in the relationship, (2) the ability of both partners to experience ethnic and cultural energies as an expansion rather than a threat to the self, and (3) the ability of both partners to develop their own uniqueness (Jones and Chao 1997:170).

In relation to the therapists, the authors stress that they must be consciously aware of their own race, culture and ethnic background. They need to acknowledge these elements and be cognizant of the social political and psychological implications for their competence as therapists. If they do not recognize and deal with these issues in themselves, they cannot expect their clients to do so.

In addition, Jones and Chao state that therapists must realize that they cannot become experts in every cultural configuration of the intercultural marriage. Concomitantly, they are to expand their awareness for instance, by reading poems, plays and the literature of many traditions of their own and of others. They need to try different kinds of music and look at all sorts of artwork. They must try to become aware of issues of power, oppression and privilege through active study and personal work. In this regard, the authors refer to Pharr 1988, Pinderhughes 1989, Collins 1990, and Bhavani and Phoenix 1994. Jones and Chao (1997:173) conclude: “thus actively allow culture, race and ethnicity to be included in our work with couples, then we lessen our chances of mistakenly believing that the earth is the end of the universe”. This seems to imply that in order to be sensitive to our own and other peoples' cultures we need to learn to appreciate cultures.

Briefly, the review of the previous three types of literature on intercultural marriage yields several pertinent points for consideration. Despite the assumptions that

heterogamy will increase chances for marital discord and unhappiness, statistics in the United States confirmed that the number of intercultural marriages is continuously rising.

The sources of conflict in intercultural marriage are complex. Conflicts can arise because of differences in culture and worldview between the spouses, negative relationship with in-laws and rejection from society. The attitudes of the spouse toward the partner's culture and the attitudes of the surrounding family and society toward the marriage are more relevant factors than the cultural or racial differences per se.

Research and clinical treatment extensively deal with issues of motivations and adjustment of intercultural couples. However, the way one feels toward such a marriage often influences the positive or negative perception of the motivations (Char 1977:39). Besides, wrong motives for marriage are also found in intracultural marriages. The best "glue" for a good marriage is when love is the motivation (Char 1977:34). However, Tseng (1977:102) proposes that the most important factor is that the spouses share a common goal toward which they are strongly motivated.

People usually marry someone who has something in common with them. The similarity attracts them to one another (Maretzki 1977; Byrne 1971). This is facilitated by the freedom of mate selection. Even partners in intercultural marriages can have some commonalities between them. However, intercultural married partners must be aware of their differences and work on adjustment. On the other hand, there can be some issues that will never be bridged and they must acknowledge these gaps too (Mc Goldrick, and Preto 1984:362).

Moreover, differences can be turned into unique enriching elements for the relationship, or into barriers. (Jones and Chao 1997:170). Spouses in conventional marriages need to adjust to each other. Adjustment is even more crucial for intercultural marriages. Adjustment is a lifetime process (Crohn 1995:41; Romano

2001:30). Intercultural couples who are prepared to give their all into the marriage, will in the end gain more than intracultural couples, who do not dare to take the risk.

Clinicians (counselors), who deal with intercultural marriage couples in conflict, function as cultural mediators or interpreters to bring about balance in the spouses' perception of their differences (Falicov 1995:237, 245). Finding connections or cultural complementarities or bridges can encourage intercultural spouses to promote some of each spouse's traditions, while developing a "new culture" that is more uniquely theirs (Falicov 1995:245; Jones and Chao 1997:170).

However, the counselors cannot become an expert in every cultural configuration of intercultural marriage. Nonetheless, in order to be sensitive to one's own as well as other people's culture, efforts must be spent on learning to appreciate cultures (Jones and Chao 1997:173).

Finally, the insights gained from the literature, lead us back to consider Prinzing and Prinzing (1991). They express their concern regarding the mixed messages of the Evangelicals on interracial and intercultural marriages. They state that although the Evangelical denominations have given theoretical support to this issue, many church families transmit different messages (Prinzing and Prinzing 1991:105).

There is diversity of races, cultures and attitudes within Evangelical denominations. Presumably, a theoretical consensus of support for the issue of intercultural marriage can be more easily reached than the reality. However, changes in attitude toward interracial and intercultural marriages need to be promoted and experienced within the fellowships in Evangelical churches.

The question is how Biblical teaching and church participation can have a positive therapeutic, or at least preventive impact on marital problems of the church members. It would be such that the intercultural couples within the community can contribute to the enrichment of intercultural understanding, and at the same time they experience

the strengthening of their marriage. This implies that there is mutual care for all members, including the intercultural couples as part of the family of faith. These are some concerns this study attempts to explore.

#### 2.1.2.4 International marriage migration

Literature on international marriage migration deals with topics associated with mail-order bride marriages, in which women migrate through marriage arrangement, usually from poorer countries like the Philippines to wealthy countries. Often males from the United States, Canada, richer European countries, Australia and Japan are implicated in the importation of brides. Consequently, studies or the media have published research or accounts on the phenomenon in the countries of the grooms as well as in the countries of the brides.

We will consider what is reported on the validity of the mail-order literature, the significant causes and motivations for participation in the mail-order marriages, and the reaction of society toward them, particularly those concerning the Filipinas.

Much of the literature on this topic has been written out of concern for the dangers of physical and sex abuses, prostitution and other social ills and illegal immigration, which can be concealed within marriage migration cases. Two key themes, which run through all the media coverage, are immigration fraud and exploitation of women (Ferraro 1986; Henderson 1995). It merits to underline that not all Filipinas intermarried with foreigners are mail-order brides. In fact, only about 21 % of all interracial marriages involving Filipina women are through the mail-order bride practice (Ordoñez 1996:136).

Simmons (2001) attempts to consider every major work published in English in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia and the Philippines on international matchmaking written between 1980 and 2000. She reviewed existing theories about the nature of this issue. She evaluated literatures published by scholars, journalists, women's advocate, lawyers and NGO researchers. Simmons states that existing work

on matchmaking reported the Philippines as the major sending country of women who are "foreign brides".

Further, Simmons (2001:47) summarizes five important points about matchmaking documented in the scholarly literature on this topic:

1. There is no single "type" of woman or man who participates in matchmaking.
2. Correspondence marriages did not show more tendencies for marital discord than do marriages in the general population.
3. The main explanation for the persistence of negative stereotypes is that inaccurate media images capture public attention.
4. The main theories accounting for the existence of international matchmaking suggested that poverty and cultural stereotype caused the Philippines to be the major "supplier" of foreign brides to men of the Western world.
5. The advocacy literature had asserted, but had not systematically documented that matchmaking agencies were involved in the traffic of women and that men who wanted foreign brides are socially deviant.

The researcher notes that much of the negative opinions on the issues of international marriage are not based on solid research but they are influenced by reports from media and agencies dealing with already documented problems. Thus, they tend to overlook control group possibility. Therefore, Simmons indicates her attempt to fill gaps that are overlooked by conducting a comparative international fieldwork, interviewing previously left-out voices in matchmaking, and at the same time considering the multiple viewpoints.

In addition, Portes and Rumbaut (1996:11) point out that it is rarely the most destitute and disenfranchised people who migrate internationally and rarely the most poverty-stricken countries in the global hierarchy that send the highest number abroad. The core of the most contemporary immigration lies in the gap between life aspirations and the means to fulfill them in the sending countries. Thus, people choose international marriage in large measure due to the belief that it is a way to resolve the

contradiction between life goals and the reality that limits their realization (Portes and Rumbaut 1996:12).

Simmons' finding (Simmons 2001:9) agrees with Portes and Rumbaut (1996) in this case. She too found that bride-sending countries are mid-level in terms of development. The women within each sending country are usually not the poorest. She maintains that it is the general social trend in rising expectations in these women for marital, educational and occupational life chances which partly explains the motivation to pursue such a marriage (Simmons 2001:190).

A Philippine women's advocate expresses several points of interest concerning the Filipina mail-order bride situation. She mentions the following factors for the Filipina to wish for a foreign husband: The Filipino women lifestyle is Americanized and they use English. This facilitates travels and relationships with foreigners. There is disparity of gender progress and gender expectations between men and women in the Philippines. Also a factor is the existing double standards for male and female as well as economic conditions (Simmons 2001:186).

Further, Simmons interviewed Elena Samonte, professor at the University of the Philippines, who has conducted extensive field research on Filipino intermarriage. Samonte's view can be summarized in the following points: machismo, double standard, unequal individuation process and the different sense of responsibility between male and female in the Philippines are some of the factors for the Filipinas to pursue marriage with foreigners (Simmons 2001:188).

Furthermore, in her interview with the couples that participate in the mail-order arrangement, Simmons (2001:278) reports that the men's motivations for marrying foreign women included the desire to marry a woman who wanted to raise children and to stay at home during the child's early years. The women's motivations included the desire to marry a man who would be a good father and reliable partner. Many of the men were attracted to this type of marriage because of the different courtship

rituals. The women were motivated by economic need as well as goals of higher educational or occupational opportunities. Common to all was the desire for a loving relationship based on mutual respect. The men believed that the foreign women were more likely able to provide what they expected, than their own countrywomen. Similarly, the women believed that the foreign men were more able to provide what they desired than their own countrymen.

More specifically, Jones (2001) studies the relationship between perspectives of gender roles and modernization and interracial marriage markets. He argues that the development of individual choice in marriage markets has led to an increase in interracial marriages and a decline in racial boundaries. The author proposes that within-group mismatch of gender attitude leads individuals to seek partners across racial and national lines. Also, employed women are significantly more tolerant of interracial marriage than the married women who are not employed. Thus, modernization is associated with tolerance toward interracial marriage.

In her study on the mail-order brides married to Dutch and British men, Del Rosario (1994:339, 341) ranked the motivations for the Filipinas to marry these Europeans as follows: (1) personality attraction, (2) to have a family and be fulfilled as a woman, (3) love, (4) self-perceived inevitability of marriage, (5) family or friends' prodding, (6) inspired by family or friend's experience of marriage to foreigner, (7) calculated action combining the desire to have their own family and to fulfill perceived responsibility for supporting their Filipino family of origin, (8) financial stability, (9) to have children with blond hair, (10) to work abroad.

The husbands' motivations are ranked: (1) love, (2) physical attraction, (3) to have a caring and loyal wife, (4) desire more permanence in marriage, (5) personality attraction, (6) perceived need of stability/direction in life, (7) preferred married state to being alone, (8) dislike or distrust of female compatriots.

In spite of its continued increase, society at large has not considered the mail-order bride as an acceptable practice. Ordoñez (1997) studies a community of Filipina mail-order brides who are married to Americans and are residing in the United States. She finds that if rejection from in-laws and society can be a problem for intercultural marriages in general, the mail-order bride situation is far worse. Ordoñez (1997:126) briefly states: "The oppression suffered by the mail-order bride is even more intense and complex because she is also a woman stigmatized by her own class and by both women and men within her own community for the method by which she enters into marriage". According to Ordoñez (1997:136), the United States absorbs 50 % of the Filipina mail-order brides, Australia 40%, and Canada 6 % according to data of 1994.

Nonetheless, Julag-ay (1997) interviewed Filipinas married to Americans who are residing in the United States and found that high numbers of these couples reported satisfaction with their marriage.

However, Catherine Maceda of the CFO (Commission on Filipinos Overseas) expresses her concern that the Filipinas will persist in unhappy or abusive marriages because they have been socialized in the Roman Catholic tradition, which prohibits divorce. She asserts that the Roman Catholic values extend deeply into the "Philippine psyche" (Simmons 2001:136). Likewise, Beer (1996:227), Samonte (1992:32, 35), Rafel (1954:5-6) and Hunt and Coller (1957:227) note the Roman Catholic religiosity of the Filipina wives in their studies.

In conclusion, it can be stated that most literature on Filipina intercultural marriage deal with the mail-order bride phenomenon from a sociological perspective. Often the concerns of social ills are in the forefront. The causes can be a combination of hope for better life's opportunities and economic security, and stereotypical expectations of marriage and gender roles.

However, the majority of Filipino women who marry interculturally are not mail-order brides. Nevertheless, many studies on mail-order brides present significant

information on the causes and motivation, and social acceptance of these intercultural marriages by the community where the couples reside. Reliable scholarly studies on the topic exist, although media reports are often sensational and problem focused.

Apart from the fact that the majority of Filipinas who marry foreigners are not mail-order brides, literature on Filipina intercultural marriages seem to suggest that these women are religious Roman Catholics. Thus, there is a need for research on the situation of the Filipinas in intercultural marriage who are Evangelicals and who are not mail-order brides.

#### 2.1.2.5 Literature on intercultural marriage of Filipinas with foreign men

Earlier literature on intercultural marriage of Filipinas with foreign nationals tends to study Filipinas' intermarriage with U. S. military men. Referring to Cottrell (1990), this type of cross-national marriage is classified as "war brides" or "colonizer" couples.

However, literature on Filipinas' intercultural marriages has expanded to include intermarriage with Europeans, Japanese and Australians. The development seems to reflect the growing migration of Filipinas to foreign lands. They are mostly foreign workers, though a number of them are mail-order brides.

Presently, the mail-order bride reputation has often unduly stigmatized Filipinas who are married to a foreigner, even when they are not married by means of a matchmaking agency. Cahill (1990:134) writes that labeling across the world of Filipinas interculturally married as "mail-order bride" has grieved the Filipinas and their husbands. This phrase has often been used carelessly, because of the assumptions that these couples are loveless mismatch and an instant marriage.

Cahill's study showed that a minority of Filipinas met their partners through agencies. He also points out that the assumption that the majority of Filipinas who intermarry are prostitutes is a misinformation. This is based on value judgment and false sense

of proportion about the number of such marriages. The danger of such negative judgment may be what Char (1977:39) has indicated. Often one's feelings about the intercultural marriages can influence one's positive or negative perception of the motivations.

As previously stated, 21 % of Filipinas who are married to foreigners, do so through the mail-order bride arrangement (CFO statistics, 1994, in Ordoñez 1997:136). Still, most of the publications on Filipina intercultural marriage give much attention to the problems of mail-order brides.

The section on International marriage migration has mentioned literature on the Filipina mail-order bride. The intention here is to examine the literature on Filipina intercultural marriage, not with the focus on issues of immigration fraud and exploitation of women (Henderson 1995; Ferraro 1986), although such problems undeniably exist. The attention will be on the intercultural couples' as individuals with aspirations and conflicts and adjustment in marriage. Therefore, the discussion will first be on the "war-brides" studies (Rafel 1954; Hunt and Coller 1957; and Buttny 1987), and then follows the research on the adjustment in Filipina-European marriages (Samonte 1992; and Beer 1996). Finally, we will review two studies on the adjustment in Filipina-Japanese marriages (Samonte 1994; and Bauzon 1999).

Rafel (1954) studies 20 Filipina-American couples. The American military men were wedded to the Filipinas after World War II. The researcher collected information by interviewing the husbands for ninety minutes. The wives were not interviewed due to problems of technique and inconvenience of arrangement (Rafel 1954:3).

The finding is that intermarriage between Filipinas and Americans in the Philippines presents characteristics common to marriage in Western cultures. There is love and concern for one's offspring, a general antagonism towards one's relatives, a concern with temporal things and a great stress on money.

The problem marriages that manifest pathology seem to have poor adjustment because of variations in background as well as psychological differences. In these cases, psychopathology exists in one or the other partner. In other words, in any environment these individuals might have exhibited marital difficulties.

However, Rafel states that most of the marriages are moderately successful and the individuals adjust to each other in a workable manner. The area of actual and obvious conflict was in handling finances and in the attitudes towards relatives. Antagonism resulting from their sexual training and values are more difficult to determine.

Nonetheless, the author maintains that one has the feeling that the husbands are constantly demanding that their wives live according to American standards with regards to clothing, food, raising children and many daily activities. The husbands make little effort to accommodate or change their environment (Rafel 1954:9).

It should be noted, that the couples studied live on or near a U. S. army installation and they have not been married very long, although no specification of the number of years is indicated. Further, 65% of the Filipina wives are from more urbanized and individualized backgrounds than the Filipino women in the general population (Rafel 1954:9-10). Thus, the Filipinas in the sample are more westernized.

Referring to Cottrell's theory (1990), one cannot assume that cross-national marriages will necessarily involve very diverse cultures even if the dominant cultures in the two nations are different. In other words, the Filipina wives' Westernized and urbanized culture in Rafel (1954) may have lead to a closer affinity with the Americans than with their own countrymen.

Further, Gordon (1966) proposes that intermarriage is the product of urbanization, mobility, propinquity, or availability. Andrew Jones (2001) finds that within-group mismatch of gender attitude leads individuals to seek partners across racial and

national lines. In spite of the acceptable reasons for the relationship, cultural differences and conflicts between the spouses are still evident.

Rafel's contemporaries, Hunt and Coller (1957) submit a study on modification of culture patterns occurring as a result of the marriage of Filipino women to American army personnel stationed in the Philippines. Similar to Rafel (1954), the sample in this study lives on the vicinity of an American army installation. The study is based on interviews of the American husbands of twenty Filipina-American couples.

Hunt and Coller (1957) find that there is a tendency to select a marital partner of similar social status even, when crossing ethnic lines. In addition, they mention that interracial marriage has long been an accepted pattern within the Philippine culture. The majority of the sample grew up in urbanized communities.

This explanation may be in agreement with Byrne's finding (1971) that husbands and wives tend to marry persons similar to themselves. Also, Cottrell (1990) gives an illustration of affinity between certain segments in society cross-nationally, such as the Westernized, higher class Christians in India, may have closer affinity with American Christians than with lower class Orthodox Hindu population in their country.

However, there are areas of adjustments to be made. Hunt and Coller state that one of the factors, which make cultural adjustment difficult, is the tendency to try to duplicate the patterns dominant in the parental family. This may be influenced both by direct parental pressure and by an unconscious loyalty to one's own family background.

Furthermore, in spite of similarities in the background, there are still cultural contrasts in all the families they studied. Examples of these are: the handling of family finances, concepts of modesty and proper sex behavior, interaction with relatives,

childcare, housekeeping standards, diet, language usage, recreational practices, and religion.

They also point out that in general the cultural conflicts seem to be handled according to the strength of the behavior pattern in the personality of either partner, and that a particular behavior pattern is expected to be more essential for a partner according to gender role. Childcare, for instance, is assigned to the wife. Religious practices are comparatively easy to reconcile, because in both cultures it is more for women (Hunt and Coller 1957:228).

The authors concluded the study by affirming that the process of adjustment with intermarriage couples results in an intermediate cultural complex, which is sufficiently unique to foster a sense of distinctiveness among those who have grown up in that milieu. Thus, the Filipina-American couples they studied did not appear to have assimilated either to the American or the Filipino practices, but were developing an intermediary type of culture. However, Hunt and Coller do not specify exactly how long these couples have been married, but that the couples have been married at least for two years. The finding may imply that one should not expect a Filipina-American family to adopt the Philippine culture or the American culture. They need to be allowed to be unique.

Buttny (1987) may also be classified as a study on "war brides " or "colonizer" couples. This research uses questionnaires with a sample of 143 married or engaged couples of U. S. service men and Filipinas living on Subic Bay Naval Base in the Philippines (Buttny 1987:129). The author focuses on the motives for intermarriage. He believes that knowing the motives for intercultural marriage will serve both as clarification and legitimation of the behavior.

Buttny finds that for the American husbands the highest motivation for intermarriage with the Filipinas is "love". At the second place, the men express that their objection

to marrying an American woman is because of their bad experience with their countrywomen. They maintain that these women are too independent.

On the other hand, for the Filipina wives, "love" also ranks highest for their motivation to intermarry, but financial security ranks second and destiny is third (Buttny 1987:138-139). Further, the American partners justify the intercultural marriage on the basis of their social situation, whereas the Filipinas on the basis of their family situation.

Moreover, as part of their legitimation technique, the American men downplayed the cultural differences. Buttny points out that the men "normalized" their behavior to conform it to the American "melting pot ideology" (Buttny 1987:137). However, he notes that potential problems for intermarried couples can be due to social ostracism by relatives and friends. Nonetheless, he finds that marital breakdown among the intercultural couples is no higher than among marriage couples in general.

Samonte (1992) is a Filipino study on the sources of stress and coping mechanisms among Filipinas in Germany and Holland. There are several groups among the respondents: (1) Filipinas who are hired to work in the 70s and 80s as nurses in Germany or as sewers in Holland; (2) those who came through the marriage bureaus; (3) those who came as tourists either from the Philippines or from some other foreign country and decided to stay illegally or marry a European, to legitimize their stay; (4) Filipinas who met their husbands in the Philippines or in some other country and have followed their husbands; (5) Filipinas who came through friends, who matched them up with Europeans; (6) students or trainees who met their husbands in Holland or who found jobs, which enabled them to stay; (7) "cultural dancers"; and (8) former employees of Philippine embassies who have stayed on in Europe (Samonte 1992:20).

The grouping clarifies the fact that there are many types of Filipinas who marry Europeans and the mail-order bride is just one of them. Also, it may be difficult to generalize the findings that can apply to the many groups' situations.

As social stressors, Samonte (1992:21-23) mentions: (1) language problems, (2) differences in values, attitudes and behavior, and (3) discrimination and stereotypical thinking of the in-laws and surrounding society.

As to the language problems, she describes the lack of opportunity for the Filipina wives for formal training in language, because they must stay at home to care for the children. The language barrier resulted in the Filipina feeling frustrated and excluded from conversations. Also the German or Dutch husbands complain of being excluded from conversations when the wives speak in their own language with their compatriots. Some German husbands are not encouraging their Filipina wives to speak German because these men lack patience.

Differences in values, attitudes and behavior are observed for instance, in personal hygiene, personal habits, technologically influenced behavior, behavior in public places, the role of the family in one's life, and the extended family.

Discrimination and stereotypical thinking can be seen in many forms, such as condescending and down grading attitudes and behavior of in-laws or people at work toward the Filipinas. One of the main setbacks is the opposition of the in-laws. The Filipina daughter-in-law is seen as an unworthy partner for their son.

Samonte summarizes the coping mechanisms and strategies the Filipinas utilize in dealing with the stresses of the intercultural situation as follows: (1) problem-solving, (2) cognitively mediated strategies, (3) spiritual commitment, (4) social network, (5) maintaining Filipino values and practices, (6) distancing from co-nationals, and (7) emotion oriented strategies.

It seems rather contradictory that social networking that involves compatriots and distancing from co-nationals are both strategies for dealing with the stresses of the intercultural situation. Seeking co-nationals is one strategy to deal with loneliness. Filipinas go to places such as churches, parks, and shopping centers, where they could meet other Filipinos on weekends (Samonte 1992:30). However, the author also indicates that their compatriots generally evaluate the Filipinas.

Upon arrival of a Filipina in the community, word would spread around of her presence. Warning about certain Filipinas will be disseminated by the "town gossip". To avoid being talked about or having to engage in such talk, some Filipinas preferred to stay away from the compatriots.

Moreover, there are in-groups and out-groups. There are factions among them. Certain groups are labeled as "sosyal" (fond of mixing with the rich and famous), the "Putzfrau" (cleaning women), the "prosti" (prostitutes), the Embassy people and so forth.

Spiritual strength, which comes with religious values, is associated with the Roman Catholic background of the Filipinas (Samonte 1992:35). The author mentions a case example of strong faith and hope in God, which helps the person through her stresses. This is a belief in God accompanied by complementary behavior such as, daily prayers and attending mass (Samonte 1992:32). Likewise, Beer (1996) mentions that the Filipina's Roman Catholic religiosity is an asset for adjustment to the in-laws and to the community. This is when the husband and his family are similarly religious Roman Catholics. On the other hand, when the husbands are not religious, the religiosity of the wives is tolerated, or it can become a problem for the marriage (Beer 1996:226-227).

This finding is of interest to the study of Evangelical couples of Filipinas with North American husbands. In this case, both partners are committed to the same faith, but

the in-laws may or may not be of similar religion. Therefore, we investigated the influence of the spouses' religiosity on couples' adjustment.

Beer (1996) attempts to study Filipina-German marriages comprehensively and to understand the motives and causes from both cultural perspectives. The author discusses the geographical and socio-economical situation of the Philippines, the history of migration of Filipinas, the social status and the role of women in the Philippines. She tries to clarify the conditions that result in the motivation for the intercultural marriage. Beer uses extensive literature research and interviews.

Like Buttny's study on Filipina - American marriages (1987), Beer (1996), finds that "love" and financial security are the main motives for the Filipinas to marry German men. Beer mentions "destiny" which has brought the partners together as the third motive. However, many Filipinas also express that attraction and "love" does not have to be experienced initially, but it can come over time. This idea is also acceptable to the German men (Beer 1996:163-164). Further, the Filipino concept of beauty motivates the Filipinas to desire having children with white skin and blond hair (Beer 1996:171; Ordoñez 1997:123).

On the other hand, the German husbands state that they marry Filipinas for "love" and secondly they avoid marrying German women because of bad experience with them (divorce, separation, infidelity). Of the 136 German men, Beer interviewed, 35 had been married once or twice, and 25 men had lived together with a German woman for more than one year. The German men criticized their countrywomen for placing too high expectation on the men, and some men mentioned that German women's financial requirement is high (Beer 1996:167). Also, they expressed that they chose to marry Filipinas over women of other South East Asian countries, because they perceived the Filipinas' culture as more similar to Western culture (Beer 1996:169). Moreover, the examples from friends and acquaintances that are successfully married to Filipinas often drew them to the same idea (Beer 1996:188).

As mentioned earlier, Buttny in his study on Filipina-American marriages (1987) also reports that love was the first motivation for the American men to marry the Filipinas, and secondly it was because of bad experience they had with their countrywomen. They perceived these women as being too independent. Added to that, Ordoñez (1997:122-123) mentions that stereotyped idealized expectations influences both the Filipinas and the American men in the decision to seek intermarriage. Jones (2001) proposes that within-group mismatch of gender attitude leads individuals to seek partners across racial and national lines.

Furthermore, the German husbands in Beer's study underline the Roman Catholic religiosity of the Filipinas as one factor of similarity between the Filipinas' culture and the Western culture. At the same time, some husbands complain of their Filipina wives' prudish sexual behavior due to their Roman Catholicism (Beer 1996:227). This was also mentioned in Hunt and Coller's study of marriages of Filipinas and American army men (1957:227).

Among the causes for the motivations, Beer (1996:173) mentions that Filipino parents may actually encourage their daughters to marry a foreigner. The idea is that it may provide an opportunity for the family to migrate and to achieve financial security and status. Also, both Beer (1996:173) and Bauzon (1999:220) state that in the Philippine culture there is an assumption that women who delayed their marriage, may miss the chance for acquiring a "good husband". The status of unmarried women is low in society.

Noteworthy, Beer summarizes that in many cases the expectations for both parties, the Filipina wives and the German husbands, are indeed met. For the husbands this is in relation to gender role distribution and for the wives, the possibility to financially support their family in the homeland. Still, some other expectations may not be met, or are only fulfilled to a certain degree. When the expectations are not met, the cultural differences are harder to resolve. Generally, cultural differences are

mentioned as the causes for conflicts. However, disappointments of expectations decrease the willingness to work on solving the conflicts (Beer 1996:189).

In this case, it seems to suggest that commitment to work on the differences is influenced by the fulfillment of marital expectations. In the study on the Evangelical Filipina-North American Caucasian couples, the inquiry is directed toward finding out whether Biblical teaching could influence the commitment to work on the differences.

Whereas Samonte (1992) deals with Filipina intercultural marriage in the European context, in her 1994 study the author focuses on acculturation difficulties of Filipinas married to Japanese. The group researched in Japan is of highly educated Filipinas, who live in urban areas of Japan. Samonte (1994) maintains that the difficulties encountered by the Filipina wives in Japan are very similar to those encountered by Filipinas married to German and Dutch men. The author mentions here: language difficulties, differences in value, attitudes and behavior, discrimination and stereotypes, difficulties with work opportunities, personal and emotional difficulties. Coping strategies and mechanisms are also stated as similar with the situation in Europe. There is a heavy reliance on socially focused strategies.

Samonte observes here that there are stages of progression in the process of cross-cultural adaptation of the Filipinas to the Japanese context. For example, in the beginning the Filipinas perceive admonitions of their husbands and in-laws as "treating them like a child". After they had adopted the new behaviors, they realized that it was "a sign of caring" on the part of the Japanese husband and in-laws. The satisfaction with their environment changes when expectations and aspirations are modified.

This finding seem to agree with Chan and Smith (1995), and Cottrell (1990) who indicate that cultural and ethnic differences are not the source of conflict per se, but personal attitudes toward the differences are influential to the marital adjustment and

satisfaction. Thus, we studied whether Biblical teaching and church participation could foment favorable attitudes toward the differences among the couples researched.

Samonte suggests that intercultural training is needed for both parties. There is a critical need for the Filipinas for language and orientation programs. One intervention clearly necessary is training to achieve competence and effectiveness in another culture, such as instructions in local history, politics, economy and culture, so that they can gain a better appreciation of their new environment. More specifically, the fine nuances in culture must be explained in context. The different aspects of cultures such as role and gender ideology must be presented, so that the wives can make sense of their value.

This concept of cultural training seems congruent with Jones and Chao (1997:173), although they refer to the intercultural therapist's need to actively pursue learning to appreciate cultures. Similarly, partners in intercultural marriage need to learn to appreciate the culture of the mate. The Filipinas in Samonte's study (1994) are highly educated. This factor may be helpful for their process of learning their partner's culture.

Bauzon (1999) also studies Filipinas-Japanese marriages. However, this research is distinct from Samonte (1994). The latter deals with highly educated Filipinas in urban Japan. Bauzon focuses on Filipino village women married to Japanese farmers and living in rural Japan. Another uniqueness of this situation is that the local government officially organized the Filipinas marriage migration to Japan. Bauzon investigates the Filipina-Japanese marriage in Yamagata, a farming village in Northern Japan.

In 1994, the Yamagata Prefecture Office's summary of the Survey on Foreign workers and Foreign Brides showed that there were many foreign wives in Yamagata. They were mostly from Korea, China, and the Philippines (Yamagata statistics 1994,

in Bauzon 1999:216). The government supported the importation of foreign brides to this farming community in the effort of ensuring continuance of rural households and preserving the town. There was a shortage of women for the local men to marry (Bauzon 1999:216-218).

Unlike, Buttny (1987), and Beer (1996), in the Yamagata Filipina-Japanese marriages, "love" is not the motivation. The Filipina wives are generally more mature in age (more than 30 years old). Bauzon assumes that they might have been afraid to become spinsters. This status is low in the Philippine culture. In this regard, Beer (1996:173) expressed similar view.

The Yamagata brides were all literate. The lowest level of education among them was High School graduate. The women were not choosy of their partners, who were 41 to 50 years old. They were mostly farmers. The women were not particular about their partners' physical appearance, whom they had never met before (Bauzon 1999:220).

The expectations of the Filipina wives were typically similar. They wanted a relatively easy life, their own comfortable home, and enough money that they could send home to their family in the Philippines. They expected to do house work but not to work outside their homes. They expected to "reign" in their homes, as it is the custom for wives in the Philippines. Thus, they were unprepared to meet the reality in Japan, where they had to live with their in-laws and the mother-in-law controlled the family and the purse.

The Japanese husbands and his parents expected the foreign wife to produce an heir to succeed the father; and that she would provide labor inside and outside the house and would render service to her husband's family.

The greatest source of conflict was the fact that the Filipina wife must obey her in-laws and the close attachment of the Japanese husband to his mother. Another

problem was the conflict about money, since the mother-in-law held the purse and the Filipina had a need to send funds home to her family. The climate, the environment and communication were adjustment issues. Also, there was no time for the partners to know much of each other, much less to learn about their cultural differences.

Nonetheless, Bauzon (1999:221) adds that the conflicts decreased and were eventually somehow resolved with the passing of time, when they gained more understanding of each other's culture. Further, the Filipino wives' values of obedience, respect for elders, desire for harmonious relationships, responsibility, and friendliness were mentioned as factors, which helped them to adjust (Bauzon 1999:221). "Love" was not a factor, but the Filipino wives trusted their husbands and had no serious thought of separation or divorce. Divorce is not allowed in the Philippines (Bauzon 1999:222; Simmons 2001:136).

Thus, romantic love was not a factor in these marriages but financial security and a stable life were significant for the wives and labor force and offspring for the husbands. Adjustment came with time and there was the strength and constraints of cultural values, which bolster commitment to stay in the marriage. The marital satisfaction of the Filipina wives in Yamagata was reported as "moderate".

In sum, although Romantic love ranked high in the Filipina marriages with Westerners, many wives in the Filipina-German marriages expressed that attraction and "love" did not have to be experienced initially, but it could come over time. This idea was acceptable to the husbands (Beer 1996:163-164). In the Filipina-Japanese context, love was also not a primary factor. Overall, a "moderate" marriage satisfaction level was achieved. On the other hand, for the wives security and the possibility to send financial support to family seemed to be common factors.

The American and European husbands expressed gender role expectation as an important factor for seeking to marry Filipinas. The Filipinas who marry Westerners also tended to be more westernized and urbanized than the general population of their

compatriots. In this regard, intercultural marriage may mean finding a better fit in gender role expectation. However, the gender role match explanation did not hold true in the Filipina-Japanese marriages. In this case, the in-laws controlled the household. This was distinct from the matriarchal element in the Philippine culture that allows power in the household to the wives.

Although the Filipinas were married to different nationals, and they may have different aspirations, literature commonly brought out their salient Roman Catholic religiosity and the importance of certain Filipino cultural values they maintained. These elements strengthened them in dealing with the stresses of the intercultural situation and helped them in modifying their expectations and aspirations, which resulted in positive adjustment overtime. In particular, the Filipinas' religiosity and cultural value that did not allow divorce seemed to influence their commitment to stay in the marriage. The studies did not discuss the husbands' religiosity.

Moreover, a social network of compatriots was a significant factor that generally helped the Filipinas' coping strategies. However, factions among the groups of compatriots could also aggravate the solitude. Here, both the Filipino value of community and in-group and out-group system could subsist as contradicting features.

Therefore, this study investigates the elements of religiosity and sense of community the Evangelical Filipina - North American Caucasian couples experience as spouses in their church participation. The central issues are their marital commitment and adjustment.

## **2.2 Literature of Biblical theology on intercultural marriage**

For the study of the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on Evangelical intercultural couples' marital commitment and adjustment, it is fitting to begin by investigating whether the Bible prohibits or accepts intercultural marriage

among believers. Some people understand the Bible as advocating segregation and others maintain the position that the Bible proclaims universality and integration among believers of diverse races and cultures.

The review will first begin by discussing literature on the acceptance or rejection of intercultural marriage in the OT, and secondly continues with the position of the NT on this issue. Thirdly, literature concerning the view that the Bible teaches segregation or integration will be presented followed by the pre-Adamic perspective as the fourth topic. Fifthly, we will end with the view, which argues that racism among Christians is the result of the contamination of culture on Christianity.

### **2.2.1 Intercultural marriage in the Old Testament**

In this section, I shall first discuss three Jewish studies, Epstein (1942), Werman (1997) and Hayes (1999). Then follows the review of Christian publications by Rudolph (1949), van Oyen (1967), and Sailhamer (1992).

#### **2.2.1.1 Jewish publications (Epstein 1942; Werman 1997; Hayes 1999)**

Epstein (1942) thoroughly discusses marriage laws in the Hebrew Bible and in the Talmud. He maintains that the prohibition of intermarriage in the Hebrew history derives its moral force from one of the five, or a combination of several of the following motives: The first and most primitive is the rule of endogamy, which required marriage within the tribe. Second, in the course of historic experiences of the tribe, friction often develops with another tribe and the enmity is expressed by prohibiting marriage with the members of the other tribe. Third, religious differences between one tribe and another may form a strong barrier against intermarriage. Fourth, racial differences and the desire for keeping its blood pure give basis for the prohibition. Fifth, intermarriage is prohibited as a means of self-preservation when a tribal group weakened, and is in danger of disintegration by political condition or by being uprooted from its soil. Thus, these people are forced to live among other racial and cultural groups as a minority group.

Epstein concludes that the prohibition against intermarriage in the Jewish law has followed this pattern throughout the Hebrew history. The emphasis was sometimes on one motive or another and often finding justification in several combinations (Epstein, 1942:145).

Furthermore, he presents examples of cases in the development of the legal prohibition against intermarriage throughout the Hebrew history. The author explains that there were four definite attacks against intermarriage in the Jewish history and they all came in the wake of a reformation movement, which was the result of a national crisis. These were during the Deuteronomic reformation, the restoration of Ezra, the Maccabean victory, and the final fall of the Jewish state.

It was during Ezra that there was an extreme emphasis on prohibiting intermarriage. This was due to Ezra's view of the Jewish community as "holy seed". Intermarriage was considered defilement. For him purity of blood and purity of the Hebrew monotheistic religion were inseparable. Thus, Epstein views this as a "religious racialism". Consequently, throughout the Hebrew history there were times when prohibition against intermarriage was applied and at other times it was acceptable.

Werman (1997) takes the *Book of Jubilees* as the point of departure for her study. "Jubilees" is a rewriting of the narrative of Genesis and Exodus. It reflects the views of the priestly line of thinking that informed both the Qumran community and the Sadducees. Paleographic evidence suggests that the composition may date from the second century BCE (Werman, 1997:3).

She argues that there are various views on intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles in the Jewish Bible. Ezra and Nehemiah championed the ban on intermarriage during the Second Temple period. There was a drastic shift from the concept of a "holy nation" as national-religious orientation to a primarily biological-religious orientation.

Based on her studies of the halakah of the sages, the priestly halakah and on the reports of Josephus, she concludes that there were three possible approaches side-by-side at the end of the Second Temple period: (1) the approach banning intermarriage with anyone, who had not abandoned idolatry; (2) a permissive trend that placed no impediment on intermarriage; and (3) an extremist trend, represented by the "Eighteen Measure", the forbidden targum, and the priestly halakah. These texts advocate an absolute ban on intermarriage, based on Lev. 18 (against marrying foreign women), and Lev 20 (against marrying foreign men) (Werman, 1997:21-22). However, she adds that the stringent prohibition of intermarriage currently survives only among the descendants of priests. They may not marry Gentile women even if these women convert to Judaism.

Hayes (1999) limits her study to key Second Temple sources, especially 4QMMT as illuminated by the book of Ezra and the book of Jubilees. She discusses intermarriage and the rationale for its prohibition in the Ancient Jewish sources.

She states that except for the need for some modification, she agrees with the five patterns of prohibition for intermarriage mentioned in Epstein (1942:145). She asserts that the ritual impurity of Gentiles is not an issue. Hayes argues that an alleged Gentile impurity communicated by physical contact to the Israelite partner is not the rationale for restriction on intermarriage in the biblical Second Temple and rabbinic periods. The fear of profaning the holy seed of Israel is the significant point.

The author maintains that Epstein's view of Ezra's prohibition on intermarriage as based on purity of blood is inaccurate. However, she affirms that marriage restrictions were to preserve the holy seed as stated in Mal 2:11-12 and Ezra 9:1-2. Also, in Ezra and Nehemiah's time the prohibition had become universal. This was unlike the rules in Deuteronomy, which limits the prohibition to seven nations.

#### 2.2.1.2 Christian publications (Rudolph 1949; van Oyen 1967; Sailhamer 1992)

Rudolph (1949) wrote a commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah. This period appears to be the high point of rampant intercultural marriage and the prohibition against these marriages in the Jewish history.

The author maintains that in Ancient Israel intermarriage with other peoples was not forbidden, although people normally married within their tribe and clan (Gen 24:3f, 29:19). However, intermarriage was accepted as in the case of Ruth (Ruth 1:11f). Sarah gave Hagar, who was an Egyptian to her husband (Gen 16:1f). Joseph married an Egyptian (Gen 41:45). Moses married a Cushite (Num 12:1) and so forth. Dt 7:1-4 prohibits intermarriage, but it was limited to the seven tribes. Generally, these Jewish writers agree that Dt 7:1-4 circumscribe the prohibition to the seven pagan groups, who were the occupants of the Promised Land. Thus, the rule was religiously and politically motivated.

Rudolph pinpointed Ezra and Nehemiah as leaders who drastically and demonstratively took action against the seemingly stubborn disobedience of the Jews who participated in mixed marriages at the time. It was a particular period of a critical and rampant problem. The author views Ezra's passion to preserve the "holy seed" not only based on the notion of religious purity but also of purity of blood. Thus, Rudolph seems to align with Epstein (1942).

Van Oyen (1967) focuses his work on ethics. He does not perceive Israel as a people of God in biological sense. He maintains that like in other great religions, ethics in the OT also has its deep roots in religious principles. Ethics and faith are inseparable. With regard to Israel as a race, van Oyen argues that foreign elements have been absorbed in the people of Israel as a whole, so that it would be difficult to conceive Israel as God's people in the sense of purity of blood. Thus, it can only be understood in theological sense.

More recently, Sailhamer (1992) writes a commentary on the Pentateuch. He highlights the theological and universal purpose of the preservation of Israel. His emphasis is on tracing the narrative strategy of the Pentateuch. The author took seriously the literary and historical claim that the Pentateuch was originally composed as a single book. Thus, he attempts to analyze and describe its structure from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy.

The author believes that there is an appreciable loss when one attempts to read the exodus, wilderness and conquest narratives apart from those in Genesis. He tries to link God's work of creation with his work of covenant at Sinai. A comparison of the arrangement of laws in Lev 11-16 suggests that the author of the Pentateuch intentionally linked the spread of sin in God's good creation with the measures Israel was to take to prevent the spread of sin and defilement within their camp. Moreover, the purpose of the Sinai covenant was the redemption and blessing of "all the families of the earth" (Gen 12:3).

Thus, Sailhamer points to the hope of the New Covenant in the NT that weaves the "thread" through the OT and the NT. He perceives that Gen.10:1-32 carries the emphasis on the unity of the origin of humanity (Sailhamer 1992:130, 131). However, he intends to concentrate more on the setting for the promise of blessing on all the nations, "the seed of Abraham" in this chapter.

The author maintains that the list of names in the genealogy is complex and shows many signs of selection and shaping to fit a pattern. The number seventy determines the pattern that emerges. There are seventy nations represented in the list. Like other biblical genealogies the number expressed a numerical symbolism. Also, the total number of Abraham's "seed" at the close of Genesis is seventy (Gen 46:27; cf. Ex 1:5). Thus, the symbolic number in Gen. 10 suggests that "all nations" find their origin in the three sons of Noah. Humanity in its totality is thus circumscribed.

In addition, Sailhamer proposes that the author of Genesis is here on the verge of narrowing his focus to the "seed of Abraham" and the "Israelites". He first lays the foundation for his ultimate purpose in pointing to God's choice of Abraham. Through Abraham's "seed" God's blessing will be restored to "all families of the earth" (Gen 12:3).

As to the account of the curse on Canaan (Gen 9:20-29), he maintains that the author points to the importance of acknowledging guilt of one's sin. It does not indicate that all Canaanites were cursed. This would not have been in agreement with what is stated later about Abraham. All the families of the earth (including the Canaanites) will be blessed (Gen 12:3).

In his view (Sailhamer 1992:135, 136), the real significance of the story of Gen 11:1-9 is in its ties to the themes developed in the surrounding narratives. Since the beginning chapters of Genesis, the focus of the author has been both on God's plan to bless humankind by providing them that which is "good", and on the human failure to trust God and to enjoy the "good" that God had provided. The characteristic mark of human failure up to this point in the book has been the attempt to grasp the "good" on their own rather than to trust God to provide it for them. The author has centered his description of God's blessing on the gift of the land: "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the land" (Gen 1:28).

Sailhamer includes examples of the usage of moving toward the East in the OT in the sense of "away from the land of blessing", such as when Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden (Gen 3:24). When Cain was cast out from God's presence, he went to dwell "east of Eden" (Gen 4:7). Likewise, Lot moved away "eastward" when he separated from Abraham (Gen 13:11), and so forth. The builders in Gen 11:2 "move eastward". It is to live "east of Eden", which symbolizes away from God's provision. They were on the quest of making a name for themselves (Gen 11:4). Thus, God moved to rescue them from those plans and to return them to the land and the blessing that awaited them there. Sailhamer maintains that the Babel story hints on the next

series of events. In Gen 12:1-2: "The Lord said to Abram, 'leave your country, your people and your father's household and go to the land I will show you .... I will bless you and I will make your name great.'" Sailhamer focuses consistently on God's plan for blessing of the nations through the seed of Abraham.

As to the prohibition for intermarriage in Dt 7, Sailhamer (1992:440) comments that the severity of Dt 7:2-3, should be read in the light of the narratives of Rahab and Ruth. They are both Canaanite women who married into the families of Israel (Jos 6:25, and the book of Ruth). Moses' concern is with the effect of joining in marriage and treaties with the Canaanites, who practice idolatry (Dt 7:4). Thus, it is not about those Canaanites who forsook their idols and followed God.

In short, these scholarly studies on the OT do not leave room for a basis of racial segregation or prohibition of interracial marriage among Christian believers.

## **2.2.2 Intercultural marriage in the New Testament**

Although in the NT the issue of mixed marriage only appears in 1 Cor 6:15-20 (union with a prostitute), 1 Cor 7: 13-16, and 2 Cor 6: 14-18, literature amply discusses the universal view evident in the NT. This section will first review the argument concerning the link between the OT and the NT with regards to the people of God. Secondly, the emphasis on the idea of "universality" in the NT will be presented, mainly referring to commentaries on the Gospels, followed by the views on the nature of the church as a community of believers. Lastly, the position of the NAE (National Association of Evangelicals) will be included.

### **2.2.2.1 The people of God in the OT and the NT**

Although many cases of intercultural marriage are mentioned in the OT, the NT is mostly silent about the issue. It is noteworthy, that Jesus' genealogy includes two foreign women: Rahab and Ruth (Matt 1:5). One particular intercultural issue mentioned in the NT is the case of Timothy, whose father was Greek but his mother

was a Jewess. He had to be circumcised before joining Paul's missionary team. This was in respect for the Jewish communities they were ministering to (Acts 16:1-4). However, there is no condemnation concerning Timothy's mixed background. He had a good reputation among the believers in Lystra and Iconium. In 2 Tim 1:5, Paul expresses his appreciation not only for Timothy's faith but also for the faith of his grandmother Lois and his mother Eunice.

Literature explains that the idea of universality is found in the OT and the NT. As it has been mentioned previously, Sailhamer (1992) capitalizes the notion that there is a thread, which links the OT and NT. This argument is also found in Robertson (1980) and Martens (1994). Therefore, OT principles may be applicable to the Gentile Christians in the NT.

Robertson (1980:38, 39) refers to Is 59:21 as an example, which indicates that the gift of the Spirit in a genealogical line can be further elucidated in the NT. In the NT the blessing of Abraham is to be related to the receiving of the Holy Spirit. Likewise in Gal 3:13f, Paul explains how Christ's redemption from the curse of the law brings about in Jesus Christ the blessing of Abraham for the Gentiles, so that they receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Hence, the gift of the Spirit to New Covenant believers comes in fulfillment of the covenant promises to Abraham. He maintains that Jesus indicates the point of formal inauguration of the New Covenant at the institution of the covenantal meal of the Lord's Supper (Lk 22:20). Also, the New Covenant is mentioned in 1 Cor 11: 25 and Heb 10:15 (Robertson 1980:42).

Further, he argues that two related principles are relevant (Robertson:40). The first is the idea of "grafting". From the history of Abraham's covenant, the "ingrafting" of those who were not Israelites by birth was possible (Gen 17:12, 13). In the NT this principle is applied to the Gentiles (Rom.11:17, 19). People from all nations can become vital parts of the branch of God's people by faith.

The second principle is "pruning". It is possible for a natural seed of Abraham to be removed from its privileged position as for instance, in the case of God's sovereignty in electing Jacob: "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated". This principle is also expressed in Gen 25:23; Mal 1:2, 3; and Rom 9:13. However, the writer added that the "pruning" principle does not suggest that God's grace works against the natural order of creation, but that it is against sin. Robertson stresses that the "holy seed" or the chosen nation in the OT cannot be defined ethnically. Also, in the New Covenant in the NT, believers in Christ of any racial and cultural background are included in the covenant of God with Abraham.

Martens (1994) proposes that God's design is the key to the content of the OT and that there is a single central message here. He argues that the text in Ex 5:22-6:8 clarifies the way, in which the central subject of the OT expresses Yahweh's plan. This plan is to bring deliverance, to summon a people that will be peculiarly his own. He makes himself known to them and he will give them land in fulfillment of his promise.

With regards to the NT, Jesus Christ declared that the Kingdom of God was present in him. Jesus and his disciples preached the gospel of the Kingdom (Matt 4:23; 9:35; 10:7). However, the kingdom is not so much a realm as it is the rule of God. Although much of the OT is about the people of Israel, it is impossible to conclude that God's purpose is restricted to one ethnic group. This is expressed in Gen 1-11. Even the Song of Moses (Dt 32:43) ends by stating: "Rejoice, o nations, with His people". Thus, although the NT is primarily directed to the nations, the survey of the OT shows that the development was not unfamiliar there (Martens 1994:278).

Accordingly, Paul refers to Hosea in Rom 9:25-26 stating: "I will call those who were not My people, 'My people', And her who was not beloved, 'beloved'." And it shall be that in the place where it was said to them, 'you are not My people', There they shall be called sons of the living God." (Martens 1994:288). Hence, injunctions

such as: "accept one another, just as Christ also accepted us to the glory of God" (Rom 15:7) are significant, because they express Paul's view of the church.

Driskill (1995) presents examples of how throughout the OT there are references to the danger of being corrupted by foreign gods. Most of these cases clarify that the defilement is not because of the race or nationality of the foreign spouses, but from their idolatrous practice. Dt 7:3-4, Gen 24:3 and 28:1, as well as Josh 23:12-13 warn the Israelites against intermarrying with followers of other gods, because they will turn their children away from following God (Driskill 1995:2-3). One example is Solomon, who married many foreign wives, and they turned his heart away from God. However, in the cases of Salmon's marriage to Rahab, and Boaz to Ruth, these international marriages are antecedents in the lineage of Jesus Christ (Matt 1:1; 9:27).

The author proposes that the NT presents a good theological basis for international and interracial marriages, for instance, in his speech in Athens, Paul points out the basic unity among all humanity (Acts 17:24-28). Gal 3:28 declares the unity based on a common faith in Christ. The danger of mixed marriages is not in the problems of race or nationality. It is still in the danger of being yoked with unbelievers (2 Cor 6:14-18, cf. Dt 22:10). It is imperative in Christian interracial marriages that the spouses have a common relationship to Christ. The fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22) is an asset to any marriage relationship. This is also true with intermarriages (Driskill 1995:6).

#### 2.2.2.2 The emphasis on "universality" in the NT

Particular consideration will be given to the Gospels in the NT, since they reflect the teachings of Jesus. The gospel of Matthew is generally considered as directed to a Jewish audience. Therefore, it is interesting to find out here whether the Gospel message is universal or limited to a particular people in its perspective.

In his commentary to Matthew, Carson (1994:1-135) selected nine themes as sketch in the debate of what is considered the focus of Matthew's Gospel. For the purpose of

this study, it will be irrelevant to enter into the debate about which is the focal theme. Nonetheless, what is written about the theme of the Jewish leaders and the theme of mission is helpful in clarifying the idea of "universal" or "particular" in the Gospel.

Carson explains that the priestly group were generally learned and committed to developing Halakah (rules of conduct based on deductions from the law). Matthew often links the Sadducees together with the Pharisees. Their views were contrary to each other but they were both opposed to Jesus. He also maintains that Matthew is anti-Pharisaic. However, Matthew's denunciations of them were not racially motivated. It was based on how they responded to Jesus. Thus, such denunciations equally apply to professing believers, whose lives betray the hypocrisy of their faith (Matt 7:21-23; 22:11-14), and to unbelieving Jews. The main concern is for the perseverance of the Christian community and the "kingdom" to "all nations", to bring everyone to submission to the Messiah Jesus (Carson 1994:5).

The theme of mission is clarified in Matt 28:16-20, which is fully intended to be the climax to which the entire gospel moves. Carson believes that, by tying together some of Matthew's most dominant themes, Matt 28:16-20 illuminates the entire Gospel. The Great Commission is the result of God's providential ordering of history (Matt 1:1-17) in bringing to the fallen world a Messiah. He will save his people from their sins (Matt 1:21).

From the beginning, Jesus' birth hinted at universality (Matt 1:1). This notion is repeatedly raised in the flow of the narrative and is confirmed in Matt 28:16-20. Matt 1:1 uses the term "son of Abraham", referring to the covenant God made with Abraham (Gen 12:1-3; 17:7; 22:18). In Gen 22:18, God promises that through Abraham's descendants "all nations" would be blessed. Thus, by alluding to Abraham, the writer prepares his readers for the final words "all nations" (Matt 28:19) (Carson 1994:5).

Also, Carson (in Gaebelien 1995) points out Jesus' intention that his followers reach out to other peoples (Matt 10:5-6, Matt 28:18-20). Jesus' example is the foundation of Paul's writing in Rom 1:14-17: "first for the Jews, then for the Gentile". The writer believes that this change develops naturally as the outworking of a particular understanding of the OT (see Matt 1:1; 4:12-17; 8:5-13; 12:21; 13:11-17), and of the distinctive role of Jesus the Messiah in salvation history (see Matt 2:1-12; 3:2; 4:12-17; 5:17-20; 8:16-17; 10:16-20; 11:7-15, 20-24; 12: 41-42; 13:36-43; 15:21-39; 21:1-11, 42-44; 24:14; 26:26-29, 64; 28:18-20). Thus, the Gospel of Matthew expresses the idea of universality, and the idea of the present commission of the church developed during the time of Jesus' ministry.

Although, there is no discussion of prohibition or permission of intercultural marriage in this Gospel, the genealogy of Jesus includes four women: Rahab, Ruth, and Tamar who were aliens, and Batsheba, who had been Uriah's wife (Matt 1:6) (Carson 1994:8). The two last mentioned women might be Hittites.

Therefore, it would be difficult to deduce from this gospel that intercultural marriage among followers of Christ was prohibited. It is evident that all races and nationalities are to be equally discipled and baptized in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and to be taught to observe what Jesus commanded (Matt 28:19-20).

Unlike Matthew, the Gospel of Mark is directed to Gentiles, especially those in Rome, though Mark is Jewish. Wessel (1994:136-205) affirms that all indications point to Romans or Gentiles as Mark's primary readers. This argument is supported by the fact that Mark explains Jewish customs. These would be unfamiliar to Gentiles (Mark 7:2-4; 15:42). He translates Aramaic words (Mark 3:17; 5:41; 7:11, 34; 15:22). Also, he uses Latinisms and Latin loan words, such as "Praetorium" (Mark 15:16). There is a relatively large vocabulary of this kind in comparison to that found in Matthew and Luke.

Further, Wessel points out Mark's special interest in themes of persecution and martyrdom (Mark 8:34-38; 13:9-13). These were topics that were relevant to Christians in Rome. Also, Mark introduces his book with the words "the gospel of Jesus Christ". Wessel argues that the Old English word "god-spel" or good news is the translation for the Greek "euangelion" (GK 2295). He further states: "In the NT the Good News is that God has provided salvation for everyone through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ." (Wessel 1994:39).

Thus, the pressing issue of Mark's time is suffering for the faith. While the topic of intermarriage does not appear here, segregation of Christian believers from different backgrounds would not be contemplated. The encouragement is that the Good News is for everyone.

Likewise, the Gospel of John communicates the significance of universality and unity among believer in Jesus Christ. Tenney (1995) proposes that the word "logos" in John would appeal to the Greeks, and the direct allusion to Greek interest in Jesus mentioned in Jn 12:22 may indicate that the Gospel was written with an eye on the Gentile world.

Jn 20:31 clarifies what the purpose of this Gospel is: "These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name." He is the "logos" (Jn 1:14). He has supernatural power. He died an unusual death. He rose from the dead to send his disciples out on a universal mission. The last sentences of the Gospel promise Christ's return (Tenney 1995). Again the universality of the faith is implied. However, there is silence on the issue of intercultural marriage here.

Luke's intention for writing his Gospel is stated in Lk 1:1-4 and in Acts 1:1-2. Liefeld (1995) proposes that this Gospel has multiple purposes. The author of Luke brings together all the data and addresses all issues that he feels necessary in order to advance Christ's cause throughout the world. Several of the major purposes are for

instance: evangelism, confirmation of the factual basis for faith, personal assurance, and narration of history. Theophilus, to whom Luke was writing, was a Gentile. Thus, here too is the indication of universality of the Christian faith.

Although Acts does not belong to the Gospels, it is considered the continuation of the Gospel of Luke (cf. Lk 1:1-4; and Acts 1:1). Originally the two volumes circulated together as two parts of one complete writing. The first volume became associated with the Gospels during the late first or early second century (Longenecker 1994:376). Acts presents the history of the movement of the early Christian church from its Jewish origin to the "ends of the world".

Longenecker (1994:378) maintains that Luke presents the apostolic ministry as the extension of the redemption by Christ. In other words, "the accomplishment of salvation and the spread of the Good News are inseparable units in the climactic activity of God's redemption of humankind". Acts presents the bigger picture of the growth toward universality of the Christian church. Intercultural marriage did not seem to be an issue for discussion in this book.

However, there is an account of the incidence of intercultural conflicts between Hebraic Jews and Grecian Jews related to food distribution in the church in Acts chapter 6. Despite the difficulties, unity in Christ among believers was far more important for the early Christian movement than racial and cultural barriers. Thus, the apostles did not ignore the problem, but suggested a solution (Longenecker 1994:414). The cultural issues were dealt with accordingly (Acts 6:2-5).

While "universality" is a central theme in the NT, intercultural marriage is not mentioned. There are prohibitions against sexual immorality and marrying unbelievers. In 1 and 2 Corinthians the early church needed to face the challenges of marriages of Christians with non-believers and the problem of immorality. I Cor 6:15-20 mentions an injunction against sexual immorality. Mare (1994:606) explains the rampant immoral situation of the city of Corinth, so much so that there was a

Greek verb “korinthiazomai”, meaning, “to live in the practice of sexual immorality like a Corinthian. Moreover, in 1 Cor. 7 Paul presents guidelines for marriage for the protection against immorality and marrying non-believers.

Harris (1994:681) points out that 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 warns Christians not to be yoked together with unbelievers. On the other hand, the Christian partner who are already in a mixed marriage are encouraged to maintain the relationship as long as possible (1 Cor 7:12-16). The commentary concludes that although it is unstated what constitutes a “diverse yoke”, it clearly involved compromise with heathendom, such as contracting mixed marriage (cf. Dt 7:1-3). Thus, this prohibition is against forming close attachments with non-believers that can compromise Christian standards, or jeopardize consistency of Christian witness. This passage prohibits Christians against marrying unbelievers. However, it does not refer to intercultural or interracial marriage between believers.

In addition, a study can be mentioned that attempted to investigate the presence or absence of prohibition on intercultural marriage in the Bible. Kim (2001) researched the issue of prohibition for intermarriage in different periods of the OT, Intertestamental, Hasmonean, Rabbinic, various periods of the NT, and different periods of the Church Fathers. The author came to the conclusion that there is no Biblical opposition against intermarriage on the basis of differences of skin color and races. All the languages, races and peoples are included in God's plan of salvation. In Christ there is no barrier between Jews, Gentiles, slaves, free men, man or woman (Gal 3:28). There is no division between the circumcised and the uncircumcised (Col 3:11). God poured out His Spirit on all the peoples on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2).

Thus, the review on the position of the NT on intercultural marriage leads to the conclusion that not only is the church of Jesus Christ meant to be universal and diverse in peoples and gifts, but also united in the Spirit. There is no indication that intercultural or interracial marriage is Biblically prohibited, although the Bible speaks against marriage with unbelievers. It can be assumed that God’s guidance and

wisdom would be the basis for such an important decision as marriage among believers, whether intraculturally or interculturally.

### 2.2.2.3 The church as a community of believers

Added to the “universality” of the message of salvation in Christ, the teaching on the church stresses unity among believers. This is expressed in the metaphor of the body of Christ. Berkhof (1979:393) mentions that the Reformation generally emphasized the community aspect of the church. Repeatedly in the NT the metaphor of the body is connected with an emphasis on the varied membership the body consists of.

In other words, there is unity in the diversity. As a body, the differentiation of the members and the unity presuppose each other. This is called the communion with each other (Berkhof 1979:399). No one member possesses all the gifts of the Holy Spirit to the full. The community grows toward that fullness when each believer personally contributes to it.

Most communions and corporations can be based on oneness of blood, of interest, or purposes. These types of communities are limited. They exclude many people and areas of life. However the Christian communion must prove its uniqueness by exceeding these boundaries. It must include those who are excluded by other communions, such as, the guilty, the lonely, strangers, the unimportant, the retarded, and those without voice. Although the community of the body of Christ must be all-inclusive, the members must be inspired to act communally through their obedience to the head, which is Christ. Thus, the community of the body of Christ lives in a state of high tension being diverse and united at the same time (Berkhof 1979:396).

In other words, the community in the body of Christ includes all followers of Christ of different gifts, races and cultures, united in the body because of the same faith. This resonates with John Calvin’s view, who argued that the church universal is the multitude collected out of all nations, who though dispersed and far distant from each

other, agree in one truth of divine doctrines and are bound together by the tie of common religion (Institutes of Religion, Book IV, chap.1, section 9).

Similarly, Erickson (1989:1038) includes in his explanation of the body of Christ, the universality of the community of believers as one of the characteristics. The body of Christ is for all who will come into it. Such barriers as for instance, nationalities have been removed (Col 3:11; Rom. 11:25-26, 32; Gal 3:28; and Eph 2:15).

It is not only the unity in diversity that is brought out in the writings on the community of believers, but also the fact that there is mutuality in the fellowship. Heitink (1999:277) expresses that the understanding of the church as “the social manifestation of the Christian faith” directs us to a central concept in a biblical-theological ecclesiology. It is the idea of “koinonia”. He refers to Kuhnke (1992), who states that when one focuses on how the church functions, one needs only one concept, and that is the congregation as “koinonia”. He believes that practical theology needs an option that can lead to a critical reconstruction of the identity of the congregation, and that the “koinonia” option can serve that purpose (Heitink 1999:278).

Firet (1986:68-76) in discussing the modes of pastoral role-fulfillment, eloquently summarizes the significance of “paraklesis”:

*In the paraklesis God comes; it is directed toward the contingent situation of a person; it makes appeal to the salvation already received; it includes the call to return to the love of God; it calls a person out of his or her sorrow or sin to live in peace; it directs the person to the great eschatological consolation; it is a life-function of the body of Christ which lives in the fellowship of the spirit.*

Thus, in the community of the church of Jesus Christ there is fellowship, mutually ministering to one another in the same Holy Spirit and lordship of Christ.

The importance of “koinonia” for all kinds of people in the church was true in the early history of the church. Hellerman (2001) studies the ancient church as a family. He calls our attention to Jesus' rejection of "purity" which was related to ethnic Israel's identification with the eschatological people of God. Jesus called into question the ongoing validity of the traditional markers of national identity such as the way of keeping the Sabbath, food laws and temple economy. At the same time, he maintained exclusive allegiance to Yahweh. Thus, he prepared his followers to redefine the people of God as transnational surrogate kinship (Hellerman 2001:89).

In his book the author attempts to demonstrate that the ancient Mediterranean family provided the dominant social model for many of the early Christian congregations. Especially, local churches understood themselves as surrogate patrilineal kinship groups. Local church leaders expected their members to behave in a manner consonant with such a model of interpersonal relationships. Thus, it does not directly mention intermarriage issues. However, it stresses the surrogate family relationship practiced among all believers of all backgrounds in the churches.

2.2.2.4 The position of the National Association of Evangelical concerning race. Prinzing and Prinzing (1991:105) observe the existence of mixed messages among Evangelicals concerning interracial and intercultural marriages. Nonetheless, even if it is theoretical, the NAE (National Association of Evangelicals) has published their official position in this regard (NAE 1991 position on racism). The NAE in its declaration on racism (1991) admonishes member denominations and churches to “accelerate the desegregation of their own institutions both in spirit and practice and the opening of the doors of all sanctuaries of worship to every person, regardless of race or national origin. The ending paragraph of the declaration is striking in that it encourages Christian parents to give careful attention to the attitudes they model and teach to their children. It reads:

*In raising children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, parents need to foster a biblical respect for all people, regardless of race or economic condition, as men and women created in the image of God.*

In addition, the organization issued a resolution for Racial Reconciliation Initiative in 1995. It states:

*We believe the only lasting basis for racial reconciliation is God's love, expressed through Christ. While Jesus was on earth, he demonstrated the risks and rewards of crossing racial barriers. Paul gives further clarity to Christ's intention of racial unity. For He Himself is our peace, who has made the two (races) one and has destroyed, the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility .....through the Cross. It is clearly Jesus' desire that all races, with their diverse cultures, become "a dwelling" in which God lives by His Spirit.*

The official documents of the NAE do not spell out in writing whether one should or should not intermarry. However, Evangelical Christians of all races are to be considered as equals. In other words, interracial and intercultural marriage between Evangelicals is Biblically and theoretically acceptable.

### **2.2.3 Segregation or integration**

Prinzing and Prinzing pose the question: "Why do some Christians use the Bible as a basis for racism?" They also state: "It has been said that the Bible is the most misquoted source in all the world" (Prinzing and Prinzing, 1991:96). The question is whether the Bible indeed teaches racism and segregation of peoples in the church.

Hazeldon (1959:121) describe segregation as follows: "the intruder and the stranger are shut out from the intimate circle of marriage and family because they are not integral parts of marriage and family; they do not belong". Thus, the issue of accepting intermarriage is an issue of welcoming or rejecting a stranger into the

family. However, integration would even be more than inviting strangers, if the Biblical metaphor of the body of Christ is followed, and the church is a “body” and a family (Berkhof 1979:399; Erickson 1989:1038; Hellerman 2001:89).

The difficulty in reviewing literature on the segregational and racist interpretation of the Bible is that these views mostly use forms of media such as pamphlets, oral presentation or radio broadcast, and currently the Internet rather than the more solid publication formats such as books or journals. However, there are published writings about them, mostly refuting these positions.

We will begin with Tilson (1958) and Maston (1959), who refute the view of segregation and racism of their time. The main Biblical themes referred to are: the origin of people groups (Gen 10 and 11), the curse of Ham (Gen 9:25), preservation of Israel's purity based on Dt 7:1-4, and the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Then we will continue with what used to be the official view of Bob Jones University on racial segregation and against interracial dating and marriage, mainly based on Gen 10 and 11. In the next section we will present the racist extremist Pre-Adamic view, and finally the writings of Davies (1988) and McCaskell (1994), which propose that the segregation view is a manifestation of contamination by culture on Christianity.

#### 2.2.3.1 The Bible teaches integration (Tilson 1958; Maston 1959)

The issue of segregation was a current topic of debate in America in Tilson and Maston's time. Tilson (1958) attempts to compare the claims of the segregation and the integration perspectives. He does it on the basis of the methods and arguments by which each party deduces support for their position from the Bible. In this book, the author seeks to clarify such questions as: Does the Bible advocate segregation? If it does not, will it tolerate segregation? Does it demand integration? If so, when? He also deals with the points of contentions on the origin of racial boundaries, the curse of Ham, the confusion at Babel, and the demand for racial purity.

The proponents of segregation hail the Gen 9:18-29 accounts as proof of the divine origin of segregation of the races. Japheth, Ham, and Shem were the progenitors of distinct racial groups. Tilson (1958:20) argues against this interpretation pointing out that this assumption based in biological, linguistic, historical and literary consideration is dubious. He maintains that scientifically, the three major racial groups cannot come about within one single generation from a set of common parents. Also, linguistically it is impossible as it presupposes the knowledge of at least two Semitic languages. Historically, this would require the recognition of Shem as the progenitor of the Mongoloid group. The Jews would have to be classified as member of the Mongoloid rather than the white group. Literarily, specialists in the interpretation of Biblical literature insist that the narrative was not intended to give an account of the separation on humans on the basis of physical characteristics. The writer of Genesis seldom takes note of racial differences at all, and then, significantly from the viewpoint of the geographer.

Tilson explains that the idea of God's curse on Ham was frequently used as a support for slavery in the nineteenth century. There are at least five assumptions for using this text in support of segregation: (1) that God pronounced the curse; (2) that the curse is biologically transferable; (3) that Ham is the original victim of the curse; (4) that the children of the original victim of the curse are slaves; and (5) that the original victim of the curse is member of the Negroid race.

The author's rebuttal to the first assumption is that the deliverer of the curse is not God but Noah. To the second assumption, Tilson maintains that it is a yes and no situation, depending on which proverb you choose. Ezek 18:2: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." However, Ezek 18:20 states: "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."

Unlike many of the curses in the Bible, Noah's curse makes no mention of the victim's children, neither of his children's children and the generations after that. Further, Ham's name is not mentioned in this verse. Canaan is mentioned. Ham had four children. Thus, three fourths of Ham's descendants have no reason to regard themselves as the heirs of Canaan's curse.

With the fourth assumption, it is equally unreasonable to assume that this curse indicates a Biblical anticipation of segregation. In fact, Canaan's descendants dominated the whole of Palestine for seventeen more centuries after the invocation of Noah's curse on Canaan. Jerusalem was in Canaanite hands until David conquered it.

The fifth assumption designates the Canaanites as Negroes. According to Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*, Canaan inhabited the country now called Judea and named it after himself, Canaan. The Canaanites belonged to the "white" or Caucasian race, with exception of the Cushites (Ethiopians) who were Negroid (Tilson 1958:23-26).

The segregationists take the confusion of Babel (Gen 9:1-11) as divine providence. God acted to frustrate the mistaken efforts of godless men in assuring the permanent integration of the peoples of the earth. God performs this, because it was the most effective means of preserving the separate existence of the various racial groups.

Tilson perceives four basic assumptions in this interpretation: (1) that God inflicted the confusion of tongues on men as penalty for their attempt at racial integration; (2) that the existence of linguistic difference denotes progress among men; (3) that linguistic differences and racial differences are coextensive; and (4) that the division of men after the fall is along racial lines.

He argues that God does not punish human beings at Babel for their attempted integration of the human race, but for their attempted integration of God and humankind. As to the second assumption, God does not afflict humans with multiple

languages until after they sinned. He confuses the tongues as penalty for building the tower, which explored the upper atmosphere.

Tilson suggests that in the city of New York the major races can be integrated despite the use of multiple tongues. Numerous mill towns of the United States then, segregated the Negroes and whites despite the use of a common tongue.

He strikes the fourth assumption stating: "The people involved in the division of mankind which follows hard on the heels of the destruction of the tower of Babel, from first to last, are all alike the descendants of Shem." (Tilson 1958:27, 28).

The author maintains that many segregationists attribute their opposition to integration, because they believe that integration will contribute to the amalgamation of the races. They claim Biblical support for opposition to mixed marriages. Therefore, the questions, which need to be asked, are: Does the Bible prohibit mixed marriages? In other words, does the Bible attach special virtue to racial purity?

Often Lev 19:19 is used for the support of the ban on intermarriage ("Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind: thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed: neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woollen come upon thee").

Tilson mentions examples of the acceptable hybrids such as mules, the mixtures of seeds on the lawn, the crossing of various kinds of apples and mixtures of fabrics. Moreover, he points out to the fact that the text never mentions human beings. Jesus used the verse that immediately precedes Lev 19:19 in the second half of his summary to the Great Commandment ("..... thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the Lord."). Lev 19:34 teaches to treat strangers with love.

In discussing the issue of racial purity, Tilson presents examples of the numerous instances of intermarriage between Hebrews and non-Hebrews in the OT and the inclusion of Rahab, a Canaanite in the genealogy of Jesus of Nazareth in Matthew. The author points out the many difficulties for using Ezra and Nehemiah as defense

of racial purity. For one thing, Ezra's demands are rooted in a concern for religious and not racial purity. Likewise, the prohibition to intermarry with the seven tribes (Dt 7:1-4) was not racially motivated (Tilson 1958:29-40).

Thus, regarding Ezra and Nehemiah's prohibition of intermarriage, Tilson's view partially disagrees with Epstein (1942), Rudolph (1949) and Werman (1997). These writers hold the opinion that in the position of Ezra and Nehemiah the biological and the religious factors were inseparable. To the contrary, van Oyen (1967) proposed God's people in theological sense. Hayes (1999) argues that the prohibition of the Second Temple period against mixed marriage was not about contamination of Gentile impurity by physical contact. The issue was about fear of profaning the "holy seed". Nevertheless, she submits that the prohibition in Ezra and Nehemiah is not limited to the seven nations as in Dt 7:1- 4. However, all of the previously mentioned literature perceive Ezra and Nehemiah's circumstances as special, and that it was the peak of prohibition against intermarriage in the Hebrew history due to the particular challenges at the time.

In his discussion on the New Testament, Tilson (1958) highlights the examples of Jesus. He maintains that even the controversy between Jews and Gentiles in the primitive church was not based on racial issues. The problems were sociological, including theological, cultural and psychological factors. At that time, when a Gentile became a member of the Jewish Church, he/she was expected to become Jewish. At the beginning of the history of Christianity, Gentile Christians were required to obey the moral and ceremonial Jewish law (Tilson 1958:79).

Also, Tilson perceives the case of the conflict of Jewish and Hellenist Christians in Jerusalem as an example of how church leaders dealt with discrimination. They did not ignore it, nor did they leave its resolution until some more convenient season. He argues that the NT church condemned the manifestation of "respect of person" on racial grounds. The book of Acts presents several instances, which testify that the church of the NT did not discriminate between Jews and Gentiles. The writer

proposes that the Jew - Gentile question, represents the NT's nearest approximation to current racial problems (Tilson 1958:90). There is abundant evidence that the emphasis on unity of believers from all sorts of background is clearly taught in the NT, for instance, Gal 3:27-28; Eph 2:11; and Col 3:9-11.

Thus, Tilson's discussion of segregation and interracial marriage reflects the Black and White racial problem in the United States of his time. Tilson (1958) can be summarized as proposing that the Bible does not teach segregation, it does not advocate segregation nor tolerate it. It demands integration.

Maston (1959) is a contemporary of Tilson. His main argument is that God created all human beings from one common stock. He states: "No nations, race, or people has a corner on God. He is not a racial, national, or denominational deity. He is the God of all peoples and races." (Maston 1959:24). He argues that the entire human race in all its different nations came from the same parents. We are descendants of Adam and Eve before the flood and we are all of the family of Noah after the flood. Maston emphasizes that there can be no real solution for the race problem, or any basic human problem apart from the family spirit. This stems from the unity of God, who is Father and who is redemptive in his purposes (Maston 1959:26).

Drawing from the N T, the author explains among other verses Acts 10:34; 1 Cor 12:14-16; Gal 3:28; Rom 12:5; and Eph 2:14-16 in support of "oneness" among all believers in Christ. He also elaborates on Jesus' treatment of Samaritans against the prejudice and ceremonial religiosity of his time.

He believes that the restrictions of intermarriage in the OT were primarily national or tribal but not racial in nature. Further, the basic motive for the restrictions was religious although there were national or political elements at times.

Concerning the prohibition against intermarriage with the seven nations in Deuteronomy, he quotes Epstein (1942:158) that: "it was partly political but mainly

religious". Further, he quotes Neufeld (1944:217) who states that the Deuteronomic prohibition on intermarriage was not because of an aversion to foreigners. It was a device to maintain religious exclusiveness. In other words, the bar to intermarriage was to protect Israel from paganism. Also, the motive of Ezra and Nehemiah in condemning intermarriage is the fear of idolatry that was creeping into the national life (Maston 1959:31).

On the "Curse of Ham" (Gen 9:25), Maston mentions that the curse of Canaan was used in the past to justify slavery, erroneously referred to as "the curse of Ham". The supporters of slavery believe that Ham's descendants are black. They thus believe that God destined the black people to fill permanently a subservient place in society. The white man should never consider them as an equal. This assumption went so far as to contend that the black people are innately inferior intellectually, culturally or even morally than other races (Maston 1959:105).

The OT scholars agree that according to the text the curse was pronounced on Canaan and not on Ham. However, there has been no agreement why the victim was Canaan, the youngest son of Ham. Further, Maston explains that "Canaan" here is used in a collective sense to refer to the descendants of Canaan. In other words, this is similar to the cumulative effects of sin on the human family because of Adam and Eve's sin (Maston 1959:105, 110). At this point he differs from Tilson (1958) and Sailhamer (1992) reviewed previously, who reject the idea that all Canaanites were implicated in this curse. Nonetheless, Maston and the other OT scholars all maintain that the African races are not descendants of Canaan.

As to intermarriage, Maston (1959:30) maintains that interracial marriage is not wise. However, the Bible has been misinterpreted and wrongly applied by some people during the controversy of his time (the 1960s in the United States) to support their segregation view.

### 2.2.3.2 The Bible teaches segregation

One example of this is the position of Bob Jones University. In 1927, Bob Jones Sr., a fundamentalist evangelist founded a "Whites-only" Bible College at College Point, Florida. In 1933 it moved to Cleveland, Tennessee, and in 1947 it was moved to Greenville, South Carolina, where it became Bob Jones University. In the same year Dr. Bob Jones Jr. became president of BJU. Upon his death in 1997, his son, Bob Jones III took over the position. Currently BJU has 5000 students.

In a radio address on April 17, 1960, titled: *Is segregation scriptural?* Jones Sr. asserted that God is the author of segregation (Discernment Ministries - Revised 3/2003). Katagiri (2000) mentions that this University is known for its fundamentalist position, and avowed opposition to interracial marriages. The University had enforced a disciplinary rule prohibiting interracial dating among its students since the 1950s. This admission policy resulted in BJU losing its federal tax-exemption during the 1970s.

After a thirteen-year battle with the IRS (Internal Revenue Service), The United States Supreme Court decided that the BJU disciplinary rule against interracial dating and marriages was discriminatory and that the racial discrimination practiced on its campus violated a most fundamental national policy. At that time Bob Jones III refused to sacrifice the university's convictions for tax exemption (Katagiri 2000).

A United States' court document, *Bob Jones University v. United States*, 461 U. S. 574 (1983), manifests the issues and procedure of BJU court battle associated with tax-exemption. Section B, No. 81 - 3 includes the following information:

*The sponsors of the University genuinely believe that the Bible forbids interracial dating and marriage. To effectuate these views, Negroes were completely excluded until 1971.*

*From 1971 to May 1975, the University accepted no application for unmarried Negroes, but did accept applications from Negroes married within their race.*

Concerning the disciplinary rules it reads:

*Since May 29, 1975, the University has permitted Negroes to enroll; but a disciplinary rule prohibits interracial dating and marriage, that reads: "There is to be no interracial dating.*

- 1. Students who are partners in an interracial marriage will be expelled.*
- 2. Students who are members of or affiliated with any group or organization which holds as one of its goals or advocates interracial marriage will be expelled.*
- 3. Students who date outside of their own race will be expelled.*
- 4. Students who espouse, promote, or encourage others to violate the University's dating rules and regulations will be expelled."*

*App. in No. 81-3, p. A 197*

*The University continues to deny admission to applicants engaged in an interracial marriage or known to advocate interracial marriage or dating.*

*Id., at A 277*

The Biblical references for this view are clarified in a letter written by Jonathan Pait, Community Relations Coordinator of the BJU, on Aug. 31, 1998. This was a response to Mr. James Landrith, who requested information on the University. In his letter Pait explains the reason for the rule prohibiting interracial dating. He states that God has separated people for his own purpose. He has erected barriers between the nations, not only land and sea barriers, but also ethnic, cultural and language barriers. Further he wrote:

*God has made people different one from another and intends for those differences to remain. Bob Jones University is opposed to intermarriage of the races because it breaks down the barriers God has established. It mixes that which God separated and intends to keep separate. Every effort in world history to bring the world together has demonstrated man's self-reliance and his unwillingness to remain as God ordains.*

However, Pait also states:

*Although there is no verse in the Bible that dogmatically says that races should not intermarry, the whole plan of God as He has dealt with the races down through the ages indicates that interracial marriage is not best for man. We do believe we see principles, not specific verses, to give us direction for the avoidance of it.*

The Bible references are explained as follows:

*The people who built the Tower of Babel were seeking a man-glorifying unity, which God has not ordained (Gen. 11: 4 - 6). Much of the agitation for intermarriage among the races today is for the same reason. It is promoted by one-worlders, and we oppose religious ecumenism, globalism, one-world economy, one world police force, unisex, etc. When Jesus Christ returns, He will establish world unity, but until then, a divided earth seems to be his plan.*

This view of Bob Jones University on Gen 10 and 11 differs from what has been discussed previously (Sailhamer 1992; Tilson 1958). It is noteworthy that Pait acknowledges that there is no verse in the Bible to support the view. He also states that he recognizes the right for other Christians to hold differing views.

More recently, on March 3, 2000 Bob Jones III issued "A letter to the Nation", in which he defended his institution against criticisms over the segregation stand. He

maintained that the core issue is about religious freedom. Like what is stated in Pait's letter, he recognizes that others have the right to think differently. On the same date, March 3, 2000, Bob Jones III appeared on a "*Larry King Live*" TV interview, in which he announced that the BJU dropped the rule prohibiting interracial dating on campus. (Katagiri 2000:41).

Both Pait's letter (1998) and Bob Jones III in his conversation with Larry King (2000) admitted that they could not point to a verse in the Bible that prohibits interracial dating or marriage. Jones announcement of the abolition of the rule against interracial dating and marriage, clarifies that there is no evidence of Biblical support for the prohibition in the first place.

#### 2.2.3.3 Pre-Adamic view

This view believes that there was an earlier creation before God created Adam and Eve. Several examples of groups that support the pre-Adamic creation view are: some Mormons, The Lord's Covenant Church, British Israelite, Christian Identity (Kingdom Identity or Identity), and The Christian Israel. They often form small churches and use tapes, pamphlets, radio ministries and the Internet as their means for disseminating their ideology.

Rogers (1998) states that he derives impetus for his study, from the awareness that many OT scholars, particularly European, from the 18th to the 20th centuries seem to overlook the presence of Black people in the Bible. He maintains that European artists and Bible commentators of the past several centuries have painted and described all biblical characters, even God, as white.

He discusses six basic views on the origin of black people according to the Judeo-Christian tradition: the pre-Adamite, the Adamite, the Cainite, the Noahite (Old Hamite) and the New Hamite (Rogers 1998).

This study concentrates on his discussion of the pre-Adamite view. This premise holds that black people, particularly Negroes, are not descended from Adam. As to its origin, Rogers points to the works of Paracelsus in 1520, Bruno in 1591, Vanini in 1619, and Peyrère in 1655 in Europe. The pre-Adamite view reached a high level of sophistication in America with Winchell (1880). He wrote *Preadamites: Or a demonstration of the existence of men before Adam*.

Further, Rogers (1998) explains that, during the 15th. and 16th. Centuries, this view took on accretions and ramifications in Europe. Interpretations began to generate from this theory. One of them is that the beast of the field (Gen 3:1) began to be seen as a Negro male. He tempted Eve in the Garden of Eden. Thus, the Serpent represents a pre-Adamic Negro male. In other words, people of color, particularly Negroes, were not truly human. They are animals and have no souls. God gave humans dominion over the beasts to work the field and to do hard labor.

The author also refers to the writings of Josiah Priest from the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints (1843; 1851). Priest believes that Cain was the result of Eve's relationship with the Serpent, and that Cain was black. In addition, Priest's friend Joseph Smith promulgated the theory that Cain started white, but God cursed and marked Cain by turning him black. All black people originate from Cain.

Prinzing and Prinzing (1991:93) mention The Lord's Covenant Church as an example of a pre-Adamically based group. Their adherents believe that Gen 1:11 and Dt 22:9, which prohibit the mixing of seeds are rules applicable against interracial marriage:

Gen 1:11: *Then God said, "Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed and fruit trees bearing fruit after their kind, with seed in them, on the earth; and it was so.*

*Dt 22:9: You shall not sow your vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest all the produce of the seed, which you have sown, and the increase of the vineyard become defiled.*

Prinzing and Prinzing's examples seem to be in the same category of incorrect Biblical interpretation as that which has been mentioned in Tilson (1958). Tilson mentions Lev 19:19, the prohibition for mixing different kinds of seeds, cattle, linen and wool. In this regard, Lev 19:19 is also taken to mean prohibition of interracial marriage.

Furthermore, Christian Identity, also called Kingdom Identity or simply Identity group is an offshoot of the English movement "British Israel". Stern (1999) attempts to explain the motivation underlying three incidents of violence committed by extremists in the United States during the summer of 1999. He maintains that the culprits were influenced by the teachings of Christian Identity.

Mainline Christian Identity theory posits that blacks and other people of color called "mud people" are a pre-Adamic creation similar to beasts. Later, God created Adam and Eve. Abel is a child of Eve by Adam. The descendents of Abel are white. Satan impregnated Eve, which results in Cain. Cain's descendants are the Jews. This is called the "two-seed" theory of creation (Stern 1999).

However, there are some Christian Identity adherents, who follow the "one-seed" theory. Likewise, here people of color are non-human. Whites are "the chosen people". Jews are descendents of Esau, as result of the union of Satan and Rebecca. Regardless of the variant, Christian Identity considers any assault on pre-Adamic humans "mud people" or demonic Jews as desirable and divinely inspired (Stern 1999).

Stern points to British Israel as the origin of Christian Identity. In the 1800s in England, John Wilson claimed to have proven that many of the most common English

words and names of familiar objects are almost pure Hebrew. Thus, the British descended from the "lost tribes of Israel". On the other hand, the Jews are from Judah. The Jews had intermarried so much over the centuries that they had little, if any, direct lineage to ancient Israel.

British Israelism influenced the American far right early in the 20th century. By the late 1930s ties between American and British Israel groups had become looser. British Israel increased its activities mainly on the West coast of North America, from California up through British Columbia. During the last half of the 20th century, the Christian Identity group grew, influenced by the ideology of British Israel. In 1999, this group had approximately ninety ministries in thirty-four states of the U. S. A. (Stern 1999).

An adherent of "Christian Israel" presents his defense of the position of his group against interracial marriage ([http://www. crutchercpa.com/interracialmarriage. htm](http://www.crutchercpa.com/interracialmarriage.htm)). He submits that because of their sinful ways, God Yahweh set the Assyrian against the people of the Bible, the nation of Israel in 745 BC. In 721 BC the Northern ten tribes of Israel and most of the two tribes of the nation of Judah were conquered and relocated south of the Black Sea. Over time most of these people ("the lost tribes of Israel") migrated north and northwest. The lost tribes of Israel eventually migrated to America from 1607 through the mid-1800s. God had promised them a New Jerusalem. Thus, he gave America to white Christians. In Gothic, America means Heavenly (amer) and Kingdom (rica).

Therefore, intermarriage is prohibited for this chosen people. It is stated in the Bible for instance in: Num 25:6-11; Dt 7:3; Ezra 9:2, 12; Ezra 10:2-3; Gen 24:3-4; Gen 26:34-35; Gen 27:46; Gen 28:1, 8, 9; Dt 23:2; Prov 23:27- 33; Ex 33:16; Dt 17:15; and Neh 13:3. There are consequences for the transgression of intermarriage such as mentioned in: Jos 23:12-13; Ps 106:34-42; Ezek 28:7; Joel 1:4 (the insects symbolizes alien people).

However, the writer adds that they should not make war on those who are unlike them, but they should protect their own individuality. There are passages in the Bible, which teach to love even our enemies. Therefore, the writer underlines the word temporarily in his sentence: "If a stranger is among them temporarily, they should treat him with courtesy and respect". Nevertheless, he concludes that the Creation requires "Kind after kind, like after like" (Gen 1:24).

Further, he presents the verses, which indicate blessings and curses in relation to intermarriage. The writer also categorically rejects what he believes to be contemporary theological errors concerning interracial marriage. He states his rebuttal as follows:

1. It is not true that all races come from Adam. Therefore, interracial marriage is not acceptable. He states that the Bible clearly informs that there were other people on the earth before Adam.
2. He rejects the teaching that Jesus came for everyone, for all races, so that interracial marriage is a non-issue. Jesus was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt 15:24). Also, in Matt 10:5-6, Jesus instructs his disciples to avoid going in the way of the Gentiles and Samaritans, but to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.
3. His negation to the idea that Jesus also came for the Gentiles or all non-Jews of the world is based on the explanation of the idea of the "lost tribes of Israel." "The nation" is the people who do not live within the nation of Israel or Judea. A gentile can mean an Israelite or a non-Israelite living abroad. After a closer look, he believes that Jesus was sent to the house of Israel, meaning to the Gentiles in the sense of the Israelites living abroad. Jesus commanded his disciples to go only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, or to the Gentiles in the sense of the Israelites living abroad. Therefore, he desired his disciples, such as Paul, to reach the Israelites in Judea and the dispersed Israelites (the Gentiles), the lost sheep of Israel. These are those, who have lost their identity after 750 years of exile into the wilderness of the north and west.

4. The author argues against the sense of unity of people of all backgrounds in Christ in Gal 3:28-29 and Col 3:11. He maintains that the Bible cannot contradict itself, as Jesus came only for the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt 15:24). The house of Israel is racially descendants of Abraham, his seed, heirs of promise, wherever they reside.
5. The writer maintains that the idea of “making from one, every nation of mankind to live on all the face to the earth” (Acts 17:26), has often been wrongly used to justify interracial marriage. There is a cross reference in Dt 32:8 and it states: "When the most High gave the nations their inheritance, When He separated the sons of man, He set boundaries of the peoples according to the number of the sons of Israel." He argues that the word "man" means Adamic man. In other words, it is specifically the descendants of Adam, the sons of Israel. The "one" in the text "He made from one" refers to Adam. The "nations" means the subdivisions of Adam-man, or the subdivisions of Israel-man, wherever they are geographically.
6. Israel and the Jews are not the same. Most modern day Jews are the descendants of 7th century AD converts to Judaism/Talmudism. Christian Israel believes that this group of Jews is a racially mixed people. They partly descend from Noah's son Japheth. Japheth begets Gomer, who beget Ashkenaz. The Ashkenazi Jews represent over 90% of modern Jewry. The remaining 10% of Jews are the Sephardim, who are also mixed. Their ancestors are Abraham, the Canaanites and Esau or Edom. Jesus did not come for the modern day Jews. He came for the pure blood descendants of the house of Israel.
7. Jesus affirmed the Laws of the Old Testament, including the law that prohibits interracial marriage. The writer refers to Matt 5:17-18: "Do not think that I came to abolish the Law or the Prophets, I did not come to abolish, but to fulfill. For truly I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not the smallest letter or stroke shall pass away from the Law, until all is accomplished."

8. The author rejects the position, which holds that the Old Testament marriage Laws were religious, but not racial. His argument is that Rachel and Leah's people were idol worshippers according to Gen 29-32, especially Gen 31:19 (Rachel stole the household idols of her father). Therefore, it confirms that the marriage of Jacob and Rachel was based on race and not on religion.

It is worthy of notice that followers of pre-Adamic position ignore the presence of instances of intermarriage, which the OT scholars recognize, such as in the case of Joseph, Moses, David, and so forth. Also, they overlook that in the NT Jesus' ancestors include Rahab and Ruth. On the other hand, they perceive the beast or the Serpent (Gen 3:1) as black or a Negro; but they do not consider the fact that the name of "Adam" means "red" in Hebrew, which may suggest the possibility that Adam was a person of color. Their reasoning that not all people are created in the image of God, and that not all races are human beings with a soul, can support their opinion for racial superiority.

Therefore, Prinzing and Prinzing's question is legitimate (1991:92):

*Of all the books ever written, the Bible is the chief treatise on the worth of the individual. Because the Bible teaches that each person is created in God's image and possesses an eternal soul, there is no room for racial superiority in Christian circles. Why, then, do so many people insist that their prejudice against interracial marriage is biblically based?*

That many people insist that their prejudice against interracial marriage is biblically based is a hard question to answer.

#### 2.2.3.4 Christianity has been contaminated by culture

Davies (1988) does not limit himself to the discussion of White European or Black racism among Christians. He proposes that although “racism” itself is a fairly recent phenomenon in Western history, its roots are ancient and varied. The basic root is “ethnocentrism”. This is a modern term meaning, the universal instinct to identify humankind with the members of one’s own tribe, community, or nation. It regards outsiders as less than fully human (Davies 1988:3). He believes that even today ethnocentrism continues to exist. It may be in a sublimated form with pretensions unknown to more simple societies, but it can pose much more serious problems.

He discusses the development of ancient racial “ethnocentrism” to “racism”. Davies attempts to elucidate “racism” in Christianity by elaborating five modern “Christs”: the German Christ, the Latin Christ, the Anglo-Saxon Christ, the Afrikaner Christ, and the Black Christ. He tries to consider the moral and spiritual implications of what he sees as new “Christologies”.

The author believes that in itself, there is nothing wrong when Christians of different nationalities and racial origins claim Christ as their own. However, unless the Christian Savior belongs to all Christians and all types of Christians, Christian universality is devoid of real significance.

Davies (1988:117) is appreciative of H. R. Niebuhr. Niebuhr (1951:84) maintains that throughout the whole Christian history, certain Christians have instinctively sought to harmonize the central figure of their faith with the cultural world in which they live. This results in an attempt to excise “stubbornly discordant features” from the New Testament. Davies presents the five “Christs” as examples of these tendencies. He argues that both nationalism and racism, in which these five “Christs” have been cast, are the products of modernity. They represent extreme expressions of the Christ of culture motif. They are examples of the moral and spiritual hazards that arise from too close an identification between the symbols of religion and the forms of civilization.

Thus, it seems that while contextualization of the Christian faith into the cultures of the nations is appropriate, as Maston (1959:24) succinctly states, “No nations, race, or people has a corner on God”. “God is not a racial, national, or denominational deity”. Also, John Calvin argument seems well-put: “The church universal is the multitude collected out of all nations, who though dispersed and far distant from each other, agree in one truth of divine doctrines and are bound together by the tie of common religion (Institutes of Religion, Book IV, chap. 1, section 9). However, there is the tension in preserving the balance between unity and respect for diversity even in a local church community (see Berkhof 1979:396).

Davies (1988:124) concludes by warning that the racial “Christs” of the culture he describes may not be the last configurations that the Christian world produces. We are prone to elevate ourselves by debasing others.

McCaskell (1994) commences with four arguments. First, racism has a history. It cannot be accepted as being just human nature. He argues that because it has a beginning, it can have an end. Second, racism is not just "old fashioned" thinking or "just ignorance". Thirdly, writing from the Canadian context, he believes that racism is not just something that happens to new immigrants in Canada. Finally, it is not true that Asian, Black, White or whatever people are, makes them different in the way they think, the way they act, and in their intelligence and abilities. If the last mentioned premise were true, it would mean that they should be treated differently.

The author's main purpose is to show that racism has a history; therefore we need to understand its origin in order to deal with it and to change it. He maintains that in the Ancient World, until the end of the time of the Crusaders, differences in racial features were generally explained on the basis of differences of climate where these peoples lived. For the early civilizations what was significant was not skin color but whether one was "civilized" or "barbarian". These were more questions of culture, language or religion. "Civilized" generally meant living in or near a city, and

engaging in settled agriculture. "Barbarian" referred to nomadic peoples, who often preyed on the wealth of their more settled rivals. In the Mediterranean region there were civilized people of all skin colors and barbarians of all skin colors.

Referring to Montagu (1971:179), he points out that both the Bible and the Qur'an teaches equality of human beings. The Bible states: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17: 26). Similarly, the Qur'an, Chapter XLIX, verse 13 (Lewis 1990:21, in McCaskell 1994) states:

*Oh people! We have created you from a male and a female and we have made you into confederacies and tribes so that you may come to know one another. The noblest among you in the eyes of God is the most pious, for God is omniscient and well informed.*

Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406), the most prominent Moslem historian of the Middle Ages and other authors, like the Greeks before them continued to attribute human differences to the influence of climate (Lewis 1990:47). Whether one was a Christian, a pagan or later on a Moslem was important then, but racial distinction was not. Even in the middle ages, Europe justified the Crusades not as war against a different race but against the "infidels".

Further, McCaskell presents the history of the conquest of the "New" World. When the Inca in 1526, refused to accept the requirement to recognize the Church as their "Mistress and as governess of the world and universe", and the High Priest, called the Pope and the King of Spain, the European arrogance was against the "infidel" (Wright 1993:65-66 in McCaskell 1994). Also, when Bartolome de Las Casas reported the cruel treatment of the Natives in America, Pope Paul III proclaimed in 1537 that the Indians were "true men". They were capable of conversion and were entitled to "liberty and dominion" (Davies 1988:9). However, later his opponent Sepulveda argued for the needs of the colonial economy for slave labor and he justified Indian slavery. In the end he won the controversy. With this idea he was laying the

foundations of modern racism and the view that some groups of people were naturally different and inferior (Williams 1984:36; Montagu 1971:179-185, in McCaskell 1994).

The need for slaves for the colonial economy was soon to be filled with people from Africa (Segal 1967:45-46). McCaskell points out that the atrocities of the slave trade ran headfirst into Christian sensibilities. "This slavery sat uneasily with Christian doctrine about the essential unity of humankind" (McCaskell 1994). If all human beings descended from the same father, and all could be Christianized and civilized, how could slavery be justified once slaves were no longer "heathen" or "savage"? The explanation could only be that they were a different kind of people. They could not be different kinds of people, if we were all the descendants of Adam and Eve, or of the family of Noah.

Besides the development of slavery, the author deliberates on the concept of the Great Chain of Being in Christian Europe. He maintains that from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment, Christian Europe had explained the natural world using the idea of the Great Chain of Being. This belief postulated that God had created all the plants and the animals in a chain from lower to higher grades. Lower beings were created to serve higher beings. Animals used plants and ate lesser animals; human beings reigned over animals just as God reigned over us. The theory had gaps in the chain. The gap between people and monkeys needed to be filled. When the first chimp was brought to Britain in 1699, its human qualities were greatly exaggerated to try and make it fit the bill as a "link" between people and animal (Gould 1985:263-280).

Further, McCaskell (1994) mentions William Petty, who presented a paper to the Royal Society in England in 1677. He made the case that the "savages" were a permanently distinct and inferior species of humanity, located between white people and animals on the Great Chain (Fredrickson 1981:11). The Swedish biologist Charles Linnaeus published the first edition of his *General system of nature* in 1735. In the second edition (1740) he established four basic color types in descending order,

White Europeans, Red Americans, Yellow Asians and Black Africans. By the 10th edition of his book, Linnaeus attributed character traits to each race (Vaughn 1982:945-946, in McCaskell 1994). As the notion that humanity was divided into races infiltrated European thought, they began to think of themselves as superior and the concern about race mixing and purity grew. The idea also spread across the colonies.

Moreover, the new "scientific" ideas of the Enlightenment infiltrated Christian theology. McCaskell proposes that there were two strategies to get around the theology of the unity of mankind as descendants of Adam and Eve. The first was the curse of Noah on Ham (Gen 9:25-27). Noah's curse is on all the descendants of Ham. The idea that Ham's descendants were Black, their skin being afflicted by the curse crept into European theological thinking. While this idea could justify perpetual slavery of Blacks, it did not explain the existence of the other races of color.

The second strategy (McCaskell 1994) went even farther. It was called pre-Adamism. This view held that other "men" existed before Adam. In the early 1600, La Peyère proposed that the story of Adam only referred to the creation of Jews. There were other parallel creations that the Bible did not mention. This idea could explain where Adam's children found mates. The theory is known as theory of polygenesis. Contrary to the traditional idea of the unity of mankind, the theories of parallel creations give explanation to God's creation of different kinds of peoples. If God had created the different kinds, he must have created them with different capacities and purposes.

The next century, in 1774 in the field of Science, Edward Long, often known as the father of biological racism argues that "Negroes" were a lower order of humanity. They are probably "a different species of the same Genus."

Furthermore, McCaskell refers to Curtin (1971: XVI-XVII), who points to Darwin, Lamarck and Haeckel as the scientists who developed "scientific racism" by their

theory of evolution. The theory proposed that human races were involved in a struggle of the survival of the fittest. Some were destined to dominate. Others die out and will be replaced. Such theories seemed to explain the human variations that were troubling to 19th century Europe and gave reassuring answers.

Thus, McCaskell (1994) affirms that neither Biblical theology nor the Qur'an can be held responsible for teaching segregation of peoples according to race. They teach separation according to faith. He presents persuasive explanation of the existence of history of White European feelings of supremacy, its development and infiltration into the segregational interpretation of Biblical theology of some Christians.

However, while White European racism is inexcusable, "racial prejudice can come in any color". McCaskel historical method may not be deep enough to explain the root problem of them all. It is difficult to isolate the beginning, or to see the end. Davies' explanation (1988) of the root of racism in ethnocentrism seems to be more all-inclusive. Both Davies (1988) and McGaskell (1994) assert that the Bible does not teach racism, but it is the cultural worldview through which some Christians interpret the Bible or misuse it, that has infected Christianity against the teaching of the Bible on universality and unity of Christians of all races and cultures.

#### **2.2.4 Conclusion**

Intercultural marriage cases are found in several places in the OT. The NT is mostly silent concerning intercultural marriage. In general, scholars on OT and NT agree that the Bible emphasizes unity based on faith.

When there was prohibition against intermarriage in the OT time, it was for the preservation of Israel, the seed of Abraham, as covenant people through which the nations will be blessed. Several instances of intermarriage that are not rejected are mentioned in the OT, for instance, Moses married a Cushite, and Joseph's wife was an Egyptian. Salmon was married to Rehab, and Boaz to Ruth. The drastic measure

against intermarriage with the pagans such as, in Ezra and Nehemiah was a response to the particular critical situation at the time.

The NT not only stresses universality of believers in Jesus Christ, but also unity in the Spirit in their diversity. The people of God are those who follow Christ, regardless of their backgrounds. While intercultural marriage is not mentioned here, there is no indication of any prohibition or rejection.

However, some literature of Biblical theology may express varied views on segregation or integration of Christians of various races, and for or against intercultural marriage. Pre-Adamically based groups espouse racial separation for racial purity of the white race. Therefore, they are against interracial or intercultural marriage. Some Fundamentalist Christians view interracial marriage as unwise, because God created the diversity. However, the Bible does not teach racial or cultural segregation. “Racism” among Christians is the result of deep-seated ethnocentrism, or negative influence of culture and extreme nationalism on Christianity rather than the teaching of the Bible.

The present study explores the influence of Biblical teaching on marital commitment and adjustment of Evangelical Filipina-North American Caucasian couples. Given that the spouses are of the same faith, there is Biblically no rejection to their union. The focus is on the impact of Biblical teaching on their relationship, in spite of their diverse cultural and racial backgrounds, and how their church community affects their marriage.

### **2.3. Literature of Evangelical perspectives on relevant issues of marriage**

This study is on Evangelical intercultural marriage. Therefore, the review considers literature on the following issues that are relevant for the Evangelical views on marriage:

(1) God's basic plan and purpose of marriage, (2) covenant commitment in marriage, (3) the role of husband and wife, (4) divorce and remarriage; and (5) conservative or liberal perspectives on marriage.

### **2.3.1 The Bible teaches God's basic plan and purpose of marriage**

Barber (1974) seeks to clarify whether marriage is a social arrangement, a legal contract or a religious rite. He maintains that three points, which are considered interrelated, constitute the primary ingredients of marriage. These are: (1) commitment of two people to live together in a unique and abiding relationship; (2) sexual union; and (3) the need for children as natural consequence of this union.

For the purpose of his study, Barber bases his investigation on the Bible. He proposes that the Bible provides the factual data of God's basic plan and purpose in marriage: "When examined carefully, it will be found that the Bible contains an adequate explanation of the basis of marriage" (Barber 1974:49). In this regard, Barber's view coincides with Evangelical writers on marriage in general, for examples: Duty (1967), Christenson (1970), Adams (1980), Wheat and Perkins (1980), Crabb (1982), Grunlan (1984), Collins (1988), Worthington (1989, 1999), Wright (1992), and Wheat and Wheat (1997). Even Evangelical authors with a more feminist leaning such as Gundry (1977, 1980) would be in agreement with this proposition.

Further, Barber (1974) divides his study into two major areas: the basic elements of marriage, and the place of social recognition in marriage. To the first one, he argues that the understanding of Gen 2:24-25 lays the foundation for the further, fuller development of the concept of marriage in the NT. It explains that marriage is for a union of a man and a woman. It clarifies how harmony in this union may be achieved. This is also true in Paul's teaching of agape (unconditional love). He argues that in Eph 5:31, Paul refers to Gen 2:24. In Eph 5:31, Paul does not reiterate

the basic need for maturity, unity and the privilege of sexual relations implied in Gen 2:24, but he assumes them.

The author also discusses God's provision for our needs through marriage (1 Cor 7:9-11), and the permanence of the state of marriage (Rom 7:1-3). Moreover, marriage provides for the full development of a man and a woman. Their personalities and capabilities are enlarged as they take on the responsibilities of rearing a family.

This positive process would probably be contingent upon the maturity level of the persons at the start of the marriage. For, earlier in the paper, Barber associates the idea of leaving parents and cleaving to the spouse (Gen 2:24) with the maturity for marriage (Barber 1974:50). Thus, marriage provides for the development to further maturity or personal growth. Some people are unable to develop personal growth even by marriage and rearing children and they form a dysfunctional family, when they lack personal maturity for marriage to begin with.

Other benefits mentioned are provision for old age and sexual fulfillment. The author states that the children are provision for comfort for the aged parents. The Bible includes the importance of mutually satisfying sexual relationship in marriage (1 Cor 7:1-5). However, it does not advocate a purely sexual basis for marriage. It stresses the need for a unique lasting commitment to each other (Barber 1974:59).

With regard to the second basic element, the social recognition of marriage, he writes that marriage has strong social overtones. Marriage, as a social institution has its roots deeply settled in the OT. The earliest references to marriage are found in passages such as Gen 4:19; 11:29; 25:1; and 26:34. These refer to a man "taking to himself a wife". Also, in the time of Noah we read that people were marrying and being given in marriage (Matt 24:38).

Early in the social development of marriage, it became common for the fiancée to pay a dowry to the bride's father. In the course of time, marriage was consummated by a

ceremony. Hence, society's "stamp of approval" on a union took on legal overtones. These were to safeguard the rights of both parties. However, this legislation is inferior to the Biblical teaching of covenant entered into between a man and a woman in the presence of God (Mal 2:14:15).

Barber concludes by expressing that marriage is the provision for a man and a woman, which safeguards the quality of their relationship. In this relationship they can engage in sexual intercourse without shame (Gen 2:25; Heb 13:4). The Biblical teaching on marriage implies that marriage is for life (Gen 2:24; Matt 19:5; Mk 10:7-9; Mal 2:14-15; Rom 7:1-3). The uniqueness and permanence of marriage is further underlined in the NT, because marriage is used as an illustration of the relationship between Christ and the church (Eph 5:20-33). This enduring quality is based upon "agape" love. Thus, the meaning of the Biblical concept of marriage exceeds social arrangements, legal contracts or even religious rites.

### **2.3.2 Covenant commitment in marriage**

Many Evangelical writers stress the covenant commitment of marriage. The focus here is on: (1) the structure of "covenant" relationship, (2) the centrality of the concept of covenant in Biblical Theology of marriage, and (3) the dissolvability versus indissolubility of a covenant.

#### **2.3.2.1 The structure of "covenant" relationship**

Bromley and Bushing (1988) is not an Evangelical publication per se. However, their study on the concept of covenant is useful in expanding the understanding of the idea of covenantal commitment in marriage. In their discussion of the structure of covenant relationship, the authors compare the form and logic of covenants and contracts. They stress that contractual social relations are those, in which individuals coordinate their behavior through pledging themselves to specific reciprocal activity. Contracts are articulated through logic of calculative involvement and individual

interest. On the other hand, covenants are expressed through logic of moral involvement and unity.

The authors assert that it is evident that contractual social relations permeate contemporary western societies. Moreover, there seems to be a continued trend toward contractualism in social relations even in the primary remaining domains of covenantalism, religion and family.

Contracts and covenants have historically been integral parts of the western societies. Both are necessary to each other, though they are becoming increasingly incompatible. In their writing, Bromley and Bushing intend to contribute to sociology of religion, which allows for a broad enough theoretical framework to encompass both of the forms of social relations.

Further, Bromley and Bushing (1988:18s, 19s) propose that there are differences between the two forms of relations along verbal and non-verbal dimensions. They maintain that contracts are verbally communicated through a language filled with literal signifiers (timing, frequency, terms of exchange), used to promise and quantify various levels of performances and outcomes. In contrast, covenants are communicated through a language filled with metaphorical signifiers (conveying strength, depth, breadth of involvement) used to describe and promise various levels of commitment to others.

The secular worldview of contracts takes the form of general principles of law and science. The worldview underlying covenants takes the form of tradition, myths and personal testimonies. In other words, in contracts, worldview integration arises from logical consistency, whereas in covenants from "mythopoetical coherence" (Feree 1975:10, in Bromley and Bushing 1988:18s).

Furthermore, the authors specify the differences in demeanor of the parties engaging in covenantal or contractual relations. With covenants, the appropriate demeanor

expresses involvement, identification, and connection. This can be seen in the presence of serenity, radiance or grief. To the contrary, the appropriate demeanor in contractual relations is for instance, prudence or an identification of individual interests. Also, the personal qualities differ consistent with the nature of contracts or covenant relation for instance, reliable vs. loyal, astute vs. sensitive, fair vs. caring (Bromley and Bushing 1988:19s).

As to the control component, in covenantal social relations participants make reference to a spiritual or personal agent. Contractual social relations attribute order as a whole to the operation of mechanistic forces such as, "laws of the market", "law of supply and demand", "fair market value" and so forth (Bromley and Bushing 1988:21s).

In addition, the authors seek to illustrate the continuing tensions between the two forms of social relations by alluding to examples of the current controversy over new religious groups as well as the tensions experienced in family orientations. The authors suggest that even in the religious and family institutions there is the trend towards abandonment of covenantal relations. However, they do not specify the reasons for the trend.

Bromley and Bushing added that their analysis is not meant to advocate either form of social relations. For, it is easy to romanticize covenantal relations. They also warn that it is equally easy to assume the superiority of contractual social relations in a social order dominated by this form of relationship.

Martens (1994) does not intend to choose the topic of "covenant" as the central message of the OT. For him, the message of the Bible is God's design. However, his discussion on the characteristics of covenant relationship adds more clarity to the understanding of the concept. He states that the contract form differs from the covenant in that its elements are: list of consenting parties, description of transaction, witness list, and date.

However, these are not the only differences. The occasion for a contract is largely determined by the benefits that each party expects. The contract is characteristically thing-oriented. The covenant is person-oriented and theologically arises not with benefits as the chief barter item, but out of a desire for a measure of intimacy. In a contract negotiation, arrival at a mutually satisfactory agreement is important. In a covenant, negotiation has no place. The one, who is in the greater position of expressing grace, offers his help; the initiative is his. "Gift" is descriptive of covenant, whereas negotiation is descriptive of contract.

Both covenant and contract have obligations. The conditions set out in a contract require fulfillment of terms. The obligation of a covenant is one of loyalty. A covenant is commonly forever. A contract specifies a period of time. One can check the list of points that specify the breach of a contract. Although covenant is expected to last forever, it can be broken. However, the point at which this occurs is less clear, because the focus is not on stipulations but on a quality of intimacy. Martens maintains that the most striking difference between covenant and contract is the aspect of personal loyalty.

Additional elements, which seem to emanate more clearly from Martens explanation beyond that of Bromley and Bushing (1988), are the aspects of a desire for intimacy, the initiator is the party greater in grace, and the element of "gift". Martens analyzes the concepts from a theological perspective. On the other hand, Bromley and Bushing (1988) study contractual and covenant relations from a sociological perspective.

2.3.2.2 The centrality of the concept of covenant in Biblical theology of marriage  
Balswick and Balswick (1991) propose the centrality of the concept of covenant in Biblical Theology of marriage. They refer to Anderson and Guernsey (1985) in affirming the concept of covenant as a paradigm of the family. These authors describe the covenant as the unilateral relation established by God with his people

Israel, through specific actions. God summoned individuals and finally an entire nation into a history of response (Anderson and Guernsey 1985:33; Balswick and Balswick 1991:20). This proposition is also in line with Martens theological view of "covenant" (Martens 1994).

Barber (1974), and Balswick and Balswick (1991) stress the unconditional quality of the covenant in marital commitment. They present a theology of family relationship based on the Biblical teaching about God as parent and the children of Israel.

Further, Christ models the groom in relation to the church as bride. They propose that the theology of family relationships emphasizes the elements of covenant, grace, empowering and intimacy. God's actions toward Israel model parenting by loving, caring, responding, disciplining, giving, respecting, knowing, and forgiving. In this regard, they refer to Chartier (1982:37), who uses the concept of covenant to build a theological anthropology. Thus, they maintain that the idea of covenant can effectively be used as a metaphor for marriage and family relationships.

Moreover, Balswick and Balswick propose that a covenant family relationship will either be dynamic and maturing or else stagnant and dying. The logical beginning point of any family relationship is a covenant commitment with unconditional love as the core. Out of the security provided by this unconditional covenant love, develops grace. In the atmosphere of grace, family members have the freedom to empower each other. Empowering leads to the possibility of intimacy between members. Intimacy leads back to a deeper level of covenant commitment (Balswick and Balswick 1991:21). An example is the relationship between a parent and infant child, which begins as a unilateral (one-way) love commitment. As the parent lives out that commitment, the relationship may grow into a bilateral (mutual) love commitment. Growth in the relationships can be blocked or retarded at any point in the cycle, when one person in the relationship is unable or unwilling to reciprocate covenant love, grace, empowering, or intimacy.

The authors argue that if a relationship does not spiral into deeper levels of commitment, grace, empowering, and intimacy, it will stagnate and fixate on contract rather than covenant, law rather than covenant. In other words, it will be a possessive power rather than empowering grace, and distance rather than intimacy (Balswick and Balswick 1991:22). "Living in covenant love is a dynamic process" (Balswick and Balswick 1991:33). God has designed family relationships to grow to maturity analogous to that of individual believers who attain the full measure of perfection found in Christ (Eph 4:13). Thus, unlike Bromley and Bushing (1988), Balswick and Balswick (1991) clearly assert the centrality and supremacy of covenant relationship over contract in the context of Christian marriage and family relationships.

Worthington (1999) maintains that his approach of marriage therapy is consistent with Biblical Christianity as understood within the Evangelical Christian tradition. In this book, he contributes with dozens of interventions and homework assignments for couples' work. Worthy of notice is the section on contracts, covenants, and commitments. He argues that commitment is generally based on either a contract or a covenant. The partners' understanding of their commitment has a profound effect on their marriage (Worthington 1999:69-71).

Referring to van Lange et al. (1997:1373-1395), Worthington states that people who based their marriage relation on contract relationship may actually have as long lasting a commitment as those who hold a covenantal view of commitment. Those who based their marriage on contractual relationship might be willing to sacrifice for the partner. However, for most people contractual commitment is more fragile than the covenantal commitment. Contractual commitment depends on reciprocity or exchange. When needs are not fulfilled, contractual commitment erodes (Worthington, 1999:69; Rusbult 1983: 101-117). It is individualistic for some but mutual for others (Worthington 1999:69; Browning et al.:1997). Whether individualistic or mutual, this kind of commitment is based on both people fulfilling their end of the contract.

On the other hand, in a covenantal commitment both parties treat each other as "one flesh". They promise to love self-sacrificially, placing the other person's welfare at least equal to one's own well being.

Worthington describes the origin of the covenantal view as an ancient concept. Among Native Americans there were "blood brothers", who cut their wrists and let their blood flow together. In Africa, there were ceremonies where people cut their fingers and dropped blood into a common cup. In Genesis, God's covenant with Abraham was sealed with the slaying of animals. The Christians understand Jesus' sacrifice on the cross as sealing the covenant with believers in Christ.

In any case, in a covenantal commitment people care for and stay committed to a partner, because they have staked their honor, their word and their identity on fulfilling their covenantal obligations toward the other person regardless of what the other person does or does not do. In Christian covenantal marriage commitment, the partners feel that marriage is sacred (Worthington 1999:70). Thus, we can conclude from Worthington (1999) that the concept of covenant exists in various ancient cultures. With regards to Evangelical Christians, the concept of covenant is in the Bible, and it is central to the spiritual element of marriage.

#### 2.3.2.3 The dissolvability or indissolubility of the marriage covenant

Clark (1995) explores the religious education of the family. He deals with topics such as: the Biblical model of the family life from the OT and NT. He elaborates on the prominent viewpoints of family life at several points of church history. Clark also discusses the impact of religion on the family based on findings post 1980. This literature includes topics on variant family forms, family communication, the view of "family in decline" or "family in change", dysfunctional family, and religious education in the church.

Of particular interest to our study is his discussion on theological interpretations of marriage as sacrament, marriage as contract, marriage as covenant, and divorce.

Here, the question of breakability or unbreakability of the marriage commitment is the key issue.

For Roman Catholics, marriage is a sacrament. In this view, it is an outward visible sign of inward and invisible grace. It is a physical expression of spiritual reality. The bride and groom give each other the sacramental grace. Accordingly, sacrament is the supernatural goal of marriage. There is an idea of infusion of grace, which supports the marriage by helping the partners develop the virtues needed for marriage life. The natural ends of the union are procreation and companionship. However, the more basic function of marital sexual activity is procreation and the nurture of children, rather than companionship. Enhancing the spouses' relationship through sexual union is secondary.

This concept places very high value on marriage as an institution ordained by God for the good of all people. Once a marriage is declared consummated sexually, it is permanent until death. The sacramental view believes that marriage is indissoluble. It implies that even divorce does not break a marriage. Thus, remarriage before the ex-spouse is deceased means adultery or polygamy. On the other hand, if the marriage is not properly constituted, or not sexually consummated, it may be annulled. In this case, the marriage is considered non-existent or miscarried, and the partners are free to marry again as if they were singles (Clark 1995:23).

Relative to the Philippine Roman Catholic dominant culture, the sacramental view is very prominent. The current Philippine codes on legal separation and annulment lean heavily on the sacramental view. Divorce is not permitted. However, the Muslim population of the Philippines is allowed to follow their own Muslim marriage codes (Nolledo, Jose N. 2000. *The Family Code of the Philippines Annotated, rev. ed.*).

With regard to marriage as a contract, Clark (1995:21-22) explains that this position considers marriage as a union between consenting adults. The purpose of marriage here is to enhance the personal fulfillment of those involved. In the contract model, a

family is unhealthy only when it demonstrably prevents its members from pursuing their own self-fulfillment. It can imply that either party can dissolve the contract when the individual's interest is not met.

The author (Clark 1995:24-27) discusses the seriousness of covenants, its application to marriage and its dissolvability or indissolubility. Like Martens (1994) and Balswick and Balswick (1991), Clark affirms that the covenant theme is very prominent in the OT description of God's relationship to his people. The metaphor is adapted from political and business treaties commonly used in the Ancient Near East. Covenants are serious, binding agreements, which aim at the well-being for each party, and which pledge an inner loyalty between the two parties. Biblical texts briefly mention ceremonies that confirm covenants (e. g. Gen 15). These often involve cutting and spilling blood as indications of the seriousness of the accord (see Ex 24).

God makes various covenants with his creatures commencing in the Noahic covenant (Gen 6:18; 9: 8-17), and continuing more importantly with the Abrahamic (Gen 12:1-3; 15:1- 21; 17:1-22) and the Sinaitic (Ex 24) covenants. Clark (1995:24) states that though the blessing of covenant depends on human response, God's covenant-keeping depends on his faithfulness. Out of Yahweh's covenant-making grows the characteristic concept of the OT "hesed" (covenant love), which strongly emphasizes fidelity.

When his people break the covenant, Yahweh chooses to create a "new covenant", which will involve internalizing of the law on the heart, a personal relationship with Yahweh, and a reconciliation through forgiveness of sins (Jer 31:31-34). This prophecy is fulfilled with the coming of Jesus Christ.

This metaphor of God's covenant with his people is applied to marriage. Marriage involves a serious agreement between two parties who pledge their faithfulness, loyalty, and love to each other. However, Clark (1995:25) remarks that while the

thematic appropriateness of the covenant idea is obvious, the Biblical foundation for applying this dominant theme to the marriage relationship is relatively slender. He concedes that some early texts do call marriage a covenant (e. g. Dt 20:7), but most use "covenant" for the relationship between God and the people.

Nonetheless, Clark agrees that the initial reference to marriage as covenant may be Gen 2:24, and that some identify "cleave" as a covenantal word. He also submits that a significant passage, Malachi 2 more clearly identifies marriage as a covenant when it presents broken marriage relationships as a case of a broken covenant. It is explicit that God detests divorce, the "breaking faith" that Israel tolerates. It follows that the Day of the Lord will come in judgment on account of the breaking of the marriage covenant (Mal 4:1).

Following the association of marriage with the covenant metaphor, some interpreters perceive marriage as inherently indissoluble, given that God's covenant with humans is unbreakable. Some people give further support to this position by the kinship legislation of Lev 18:6-18 linked to the "one flesh" terminology (Gen 2:24). Thus, marriage establishes permanent kinship relationships with a new family. One is not to break covenantal family relationships, as much as one is not to break blood family relationships.

However, others oppose the use of Lev 18 and Gen 2:24 as signifying permanent relationship. They maintain that in 1 Cor 6:16, Paul uses "one flesh" not in covenantal sense. It simply expresses sexual and relational aspects, which are not permanent (relationship with a prostitute). To the contrary, the defendants of the indissoluble covenant argue that Paul is applying Gen 2:24 analogically to a new situation, and that he is not exegeting it in its original context. Thus, the indissolubility expressed in Gen. 2:24 still stands.

Clark (1995:26) concludes that the indissolubility of God's covenant with his people arises, not from the inherent unbreakableness of covenants, but from the determined

character and will of the covenant-maker. God's covenant is indissoluble, not because of the essence of covenants. It is because of who God is. Covenants can be broken, but God will not break his covenant.

Furthermore, Matt 19:6, "What God has joined together, let man not separate", is a key NT reference used to support the indissolubility of the marriage covenant. The author argues that this statement is not descriptive (i.e. we cannot separate), but normative (i.e. we ought not separate). In other words, Jesus is not saying that it is impossible to dissolve a marriage, but that it should not be done. Clark continues the argument by stating that the very act of forbidding the dissolution of marriage proves that marriage is dissolvable. For, it would be meaningless to prohibit the impossible (Clark 1995:26).

Clark (1995:26) can be summarized as emphasizing the idea of covenant marriage. He affirms that marriage is a serious relationship between two parties, intended by the two as a permanent, faithful relationship, which enriches both parties. A covenant is bound together by "hesed". It is a special and powerful love characterized by faithfulness and loyalty to their spouses. In other words, to break a covenant is a serious offense. Just as God is faithful to his people, so married partners should exhibit uncompromising loyalty to their own spouses, and thus model the story of redemption. Hence, using covenant as an image for marriage is appropriate Biblically and meaningful theologically. In short, marriage as a covenant can be dissolved but should not be dissolved.

It is noteworthy that in the United States on November 14, 2000, representatives of the Roman Catholic sacramental position and the Evangelical covenant position were able to issue jointly *A Christian Declaration on Marriage* (see Appendices). The signers are Bishop Anthony O'Connell (Chairman of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Committee on Marriage and Family Life), Dr. Richard Land (President, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, Southern Baptist Convention),

and Bishop Kevin Mannoia (President of the National Association of Evangelicals).

The first paragraph of the declaration reads:

*As we celebrate the 2000th anniversary of the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ, entering the third millennium, we pledge together to honor the Lord by committing ourselves afresh to God's first institution - marriage. We believe that marriage is a holy union of one man and one woman in which they commit, with God's help, to build a loving, life-giving, faithful relationship that will last for a lifetime. God has established the married state, in the order of creation and redemption, for spouses to grow in love of one another and for the procreation, nurture, formation and education of children. We believe that in marriage many principles of the Kingdom of God are manifested. The interdependence of healthy Christian community is clearly exemplified in loving one another (John 13:34), forgiving one another (Ephesians 4:32), confessing to one another (James 5:16), and submitting to one another (Ephesians 5:21). These principles find unique fulfillment in marriage. Marriage is God's gift, a living image of the union between Christ and His Church. We believe that when a marriage is true to God's loving design it brings spiritual, physical, emotional, economic, and social benefits not only to a couple and family but also to the Church and to the wider culture. Couples, churches, and the whole of society have a stake in the well being of marriages. Each, therefore, has its own obligations to prepare, strengthen, support and restore marriages.*

### **2.3.3 The role of husband and wife**

The role adjustment of husband and wife is a relevant issue for marital satisfaction and stability. This issue may even be more salient in intercultural marriage situations, when partners' role expectations are influenced by different cultural backgrounds. For this reason, Imamura (1986b) maintains that international marriage data is particularly useful for research, because differences in role expectation in the spouses' societies are often more readily apparent than in intranational marriage. Thus, for the

study of Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian men, it is worthwhile to consider the Evangelical view of husband and wife's roles

Literature on the role of husband and wife portrays the Evangelical debate concerning three positions on this issue: (1) the traditional (submission) role, (2) the equality (mutuality or partnership) role, and (3) the equality and submission (continuum) role.

Grunlan (1984) states in his publication that he does not purpose to provide the "right" answers to Biblical truth concerning marriage and family but that he intends to help his readers to think through and reach their own conclusions. He presents a panoramic view on the different Evangelical positions on spousal roles. Noteworthy is the discussion on the changing roles of husband and wife, the traditional, the partnership, and the equality and submission (continuum) view of husband and wife that exists in the decade of his writing.

#### 2.3.3.1 Traditional or submission view

Evangelical Christian writers on marriage display a diversity of opinions on this issue. For example, Hendricks (1973) promotes the traditional position where the husband is the head of the home. The wife is to submit to his authority and leadership. He contends that the Bible in Eph 5 makes it clear that the husband is the head of the home. The husband is the authority. However, v.18 also states the filling of the Spirit, which controls the believer. V. 21 underlines submission to one another in the fear of God. Therefore, Hendricks argues that submission is not the exclusive responsibility of the woman. The filling of the Holy Spirit involves submission to Christ for both spouses.

However, the husband is the leader in the marriage, although not a dictator. He is leader and lover (Eph 5:25-29). He is to love his wife like Christ loved the church. Thus, though Hendricks (1973) adheres to the traditional position, which affirms the husband's role of leadership and authority in the marriage, he also subscribes to

mutual submission of husband and wife in the fear of the God. Nevertheless, he accentuates the husband's leadership by adding that if the woman cannot submit to her husband's leadership, the reason is because she cannot submit to God. Because the filling of the Holy Spirit enables submission, it can be deduced that lack of submission result from spiritual weakness. Still, it is rather difficult to explain mutual submission when one is hierarchically placed over the other. Nonetheless, Hendricks stresses the husband's loving leadership.

Another popular Evangelical writer who holds this perspective is Christenson (1970). This author subscribes to a hierarchical structure of authority in the family roles and responsibilities: God is first in the sequence, then the husband, next the wife and lastly the children (Christenson 1970:17-18).

Similarly, Getz (1972:25) underlines that throughout the OT the pattern of government of the family has the man as the head. This is God's plan. This principle is reaffirmed in the NT time, and it is illustrated by Christ's headship of the church

Gangle (1972) strongly argues for the rule of the husband based on his understanding of the teaching of the Bible. On the husband's authority, he states: "The quality of 'headship' certainly refers to the deciding voice in the family" (Gangle 1972:40).

#### 2.3.3.2 The equality position

Gundry (1977) holds to the "equality" position of husband and wife. She maintains that traditionally certain Bible passages have been used to restrict women to a narrow place in the church and society. The "problem passages" are for instance: Gen 3:6; 1 Cor 11:3-16; 1 Cor 11:5; 1 Cor 14:34, 35; 1 Tim 2:12; Eph 5:22-24; Titus 2:3-5; and 1 Pe 3:1-6. She suggests to the readers to discover what the passages were attempting to teach the people to whom they were written, determine the principles implicit in them, and then apply those principles to life (Gundry 1977:57).

Further, the writer adds that in the actual practice the individual pastor interprets most of these verses to suit his own ideas about women. Thus, she presents a guideline of ten points for method of accurate Bible interpretation.

It is possible that some who affirm other positions on the role of husband and wife may have arrived at their conclusion by faulty method of interpretation. However, there is reason to believe that many other scholars have also reliably used the same method of interpretation, yet have come to a different conclusion and have settled for another view. In other words, although the issue of hermeneutics is a very significant one, it is hard to conceive that all those who do not promote the "equality" view are unbiblical. It is, however, evident that the element of cultural context is very important for Gundry. She poses these questions:

*Should we assume that since God revealed Himself to a nation with a patriarchal form of family life that He approves a patriarchal system? Can we assume that since God has prospered American Christians to the point where they can send missionaries to many other cultures that He is thereby approving our culture and wishes us to teach it along with Christianity? Many missionaries have mingled the two to the detriment of their converts and the gospel. (Gundry 1977:59)*

Gundry (1977) concludes that the great tenets of Christianity are freedom and love. In the first century AD the great oppressions were slavery, tyranny, fear, and hate. Thus, Christ's impact brought joy to believers because of its new message. They experienced love and freedom in Christ, which they had never had in the world (Gundry 1977:81). Also, her view of equality of husband and wife's role seems to be hand in hand with her view of women's freedom in participating in the ministry of the church.

In another study, Gundry (1980) traces hierarchical Christian marriage customs and traditions through the centuries. The author attempts to show how much material that

has been taught has not come from Scripture. She explains how these teachings derive from medieval theologians. Like her previous publication (Gundry 1977), she attempts to put forward the importance of hermeneutics. She examines the theological position, which shows a theology of relationships in marriage. She discusses that marriage is built on the principles of intimacy and equality, the controversy of Scripture versus the Evangelical status quo, and redemption versus tradition.

She understands the word "helpmeet" of "ezer" and "neged" (Gen 2:18, 20) as indicating "equality" of the role of husband and wife. She opposes the traditionalists' argument that Gen 3:16 ascribes men's dominion over women as the result of the fall to sin. Gundry points out that this passage is predictive, based on the use of the Hebrew tenses. It is a prophecy and not a penalty (Gundry 1980:87). She argues that in the past we have taken this prediction of sin's result and have tried to institutionalize it and enforce it as God's will. Instead, we should be working to reverse it, to reinstate the lost relationship of mutual responsibility and respect (Gundry 1980:88). Also, she emphasizes mutual submission with her interpretation of Eph 5:21 and 22. She points out that the word "submit" does not occur in the Greek text of v. 22. The participle in v. 22 continues the previous verse. Thus, "submitting yourselves to one another in the fear of Christ, wives to your own husbands as to the Lord in everything", is the correct understanding.

The author articulates the issues of translation from the original language, and the interpretation and cultural factor concerning the concept of headship of the husband such as in the phrase "washing with water through the word" of the wife by the husband (Eph 5:25-7). Here, she explains the Greek ritual for the cleansing of the bride on the wedding day. In analogy, Christ by means of His Word, makes possible a continuous and complete cleansing far better than the pagan bride cleansing. Thus, the husband must not settle for the pagan attitude toward his bride. He must offer himself. He is to love like Christ loves the church, who gives her the best He has. He offers his word and membership in His body. Thus, she argues that this passage

teaches the husband to give his best, rather than instructing the husband to be responsible for his wife's spiritual life and growth (Gundry 1980:114-115).

Gundry consistently argues for the position of "equality" and "mutuality" of husband and wife. She is strong in hermeneutics, exegesis and research on cultural context. In her application of the concept of "joint heirs" (1 Pe 3:7), Gundry (1980) emphasizes mutuality, and the reaching out to one another by sharing the best one enjoys as individuals. The author maintains that sharing means more than "cutting the piece of cake in two equals".

About a decade later, Browning et al. (1997) report on the trend of a cultural shift toward defining love as mutuality in marriage and family relationships. In their national survey, they defined mutuality as treating both self and other with equal seriousness. However, Browning et al. concede that they cannot be certain, that the respondents who value mutuality understood their question as it was asked.

The authors attempt to address the issues of mutuality in the light of the wider concerns of the Christian faith. Four significant themes they discuss are: (1) the centrality of equal regard in a Christian view of love, (2) the legitimate place of self-sacrifice in the service of mutuality, (3) the need for life-cycle perspective on discerning the meaning of equal regard in families, and (4) the subordination of families to the larger common good, whether seen as the common good of civil society or the kingdom or reign of God. Browning et al. (1997) propose that these themes emerge from their study of tradition and Scripture.

Further, in their discussion of self-sacrifice, they bring out that self-sacrificial love is not an end in itself. It has the purpose of promoting the welfare of others. Christ did not die on the cross for the sake of self-surrender. He accepted death as the consequence of his commitment to mutual love (Browning et al. 1997:283). These writers saw a close relationship between self-sacrifice and equal regard as stated in Eph 5:25-28: "Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her" (Eph 5:25).

"Even so husbands should love their wives as their own bodies" (Eph 5:28). They maintain that this is a consequence of understanding the "one flesh" in Gen. 2:24 as a covenant.

Browning et al. (1997) clearly discuss their view on mutuality. They perceive the elements of self-sacrifice and loving the other as oneself as inseparable. However, the finding of their survey is limited to the fact that the current American culture values the language of mutuality more than the language of sacrificial love. They have some doubt concerning the respondents' understanding of the meaning of mutuality. It can be equality in the sense of reciprocity (contract) or equality as meeting the partner's need to the point of self-sacrifice (covenant).

Nevertheless, the researchers' face-to-face interviews contribute some significant information on the trend to mutuality. In these interviews they were searching for models of love and obligation found in various well functioning American families. Their attempt was to learn which of the three models of love (love as self-sacrifice, love as mutuality, or love as individual fulfillment) couples think they predominantly follow. They also wanted to find out how the marriage of this generation compares to their parents'.

Browning et al. (1997:8-9) reported that couples today believe that they enjoy more mutuality and are less self-sacrificial than their parents. They see their roles as far more flexible than those of their parents, though wives today are still more tied to domestic responsibilities than the husbands. Couples today think their mothers were much more inclined to see their role at the home either full-time or part-time. They also share access to bank accounts and checkbooks more than their mothers did.

Also, couples think that they share more completely in the raising and disciplining of children than their parents did. Fathers today feel they are more expressive and share more feelings with their children than did their fathers. They get more involved in moral discussions with their children than their parents. They perceive their parents

as more "cut and dried" in this regard. They consider their present families to be disciplined, but they are also more willing to "enjoy" life than their parents.

Further, they think they are more concerned about women's issues than their parents were. They are more concerned about educating their daughters for an unpredictable future. Their parents often "sacrificed" to educate their daughters but generally for traditional female vocations.

Furthermore, these researchers indicate their surprise on two issues. Although parents feel they talk more with their children, reveal feelings more, and struggle with them more about a greater number of issues, they do not feel they get much help from institutions outside the home. Thus, churches, schools, the media, and neighbors do not help as they did a generation ago. Parents today think that the ecology of family supports has deteriorated. They feel they must compensate for the decline of trustworthy institutions. Many concerned parents interviewed, felt that they have to do more in shaping their children lives. Consequently, adults today think they "felt freer" as kids and had less parental supervision than is the case for their children today (Browning et al. 1997:9).

Thus, in spite of the continued debate on the different perspectives of husband and wife's roles, this study seems to suggest that in reality society and culture in North America has changed towards equality. However, in spite of this change, social institutions and neighbors seem to be less involved and supportive of families. The sense of equality and individuality has not resulted in freer and happier families.

#### 2.3.3.3 The continuum model

Howell (1979) includes discussions of the various patterns of husband and wife's roles. The author maintains that there can be different marriage relation styles within Christian marriage. The important point is that the Holy Spirit guides the marriage. In their commitment to building a Christian marriage, couples are free to work out a role relationship, which meets their own personality needs (Howell 1979:128). Thus,

there can be the patriarchal or traditional model, the partnership or companionship model, and the continuum model.

The continuum model is flexible and is somewhere between the two poles of traditional and partnership. Howell (1979) believes, that in reality many marital roles will result in blending of the styles. Also, he proposes that parental models, personality and temperament characteristics, religious teachings and personal experience often influence how couples form their relationship. There is the danger of justifying a relationship style based on personality needs using theological arguments (Howell 1979:128).

It is also possible to change from one model to another, for instance, from traditional to a more egalitarian model. However, giving up one style for another cannot be done suddenly and drastically. Besides, one of the partners may not change as rapidly as the other.

In his discussion of several authors of the traditional position, he criticizes that they seem to stress the traditional model as the only Biblical pattern, and that this is the only one, which can provide happiness. As examples, he mentions Tim La Haye: *How to be happy though married*; Larry Christenson: *The Christian family*; Bill Gothard: *Basic youth conflicts*; and Marabel Morgan: *The total woman (and total joy)*. Howell points out that each of these publications emphasizes the need of submission of the wife. Hence they support the submission model.

Howell's concern is that the authors fail to give attention to successful Christian marriages, which are following the partnership pattern. In other words, they do not acquaint their readers with other options for adjustment. Therefore, the writer mentions possible choices from the equality or partnership model, such as, in the books by Mace: *We can have better marriages if we really want them*, Samuel Southard: *Like the one you love. Intimacy and equality in modern marriage*,

Stapleton and Bright: *Equal marriage*, Reuben Herring: *Building a better marriage*, and Howard Clinebell: *The intimate marriage*.

Howell concludes that the couples who love each other in the fullest sense of Christian love and who are committed to Christ's leadership in their lives can work out any one of a number of modifications of these patterns of relationship and find happiness. However, they must be sensitive to God's will for their individual lives and willing to be open to each other in finding their understanding of marriage (Howell 1979:128).

#### 2.3.3.4 Gender role views are not merely an issue of hermeneutics

The literature reviewed so far shows that the debate on role issues among Evangelical Christians is strongly influenced by the way each camp interprets certain key Biblical passages on the role of husband and wife. Furthermore, Schlueter (1997) argues that there are three kinds of interpretations on Eph 5:22: (1) the rejecters, (2) the receivers, and (3) the revitalizers.

1. Rejecters do not find recipe for healthy living in this passage. They just consider it as no longer applicable to modern people. They reject all Scripture and even the Christian community.
2. Receivers are Evangelicals, who accept a literal interpretation of the English translation and maintain that the exhortation for wives is to be submissive to their husbands according to God's plan. Women Receivers assert that the passage frees them rather than restricts them. Male Receivers contend that the passage provides clear identity.
3. Revitalizers are Evangelicals, who maintain that one needs to interpret the passage with Scriptures in one hand and newspaper and/or their experience in the other. Therefore, they are aware that this passage has been used to sanction the abuse of women. They look to Paul for evidence of the egalitarian nature of the earliest church. Revitalizers maintain a position of

hermeneutics of suspicion. Their thought is that the general traditional interpretation was colored by male dominated culture.

Added to that, Schlueter states that although she discusses various approaches, she supports only revitalizers. (Schlueters 1997:318). She blames abuse of women among Evangelicals on the hierarchical interpretation of Eph 5:22. Thus, it appears that positions on the role of husband and wife may not only be based on theological perspectives but they can also be emotionally charged.

Fox-Genovese, Grenz, Keyes, and van Leeuwen's debate is based on Elizabeth Fox-Genovese's address at the fourth annual Kuyper Lecture, Oct. 29, 1998 (Fox-Genovese 2000). The speaker and the three respondents have different views on the role of women, although they are all Evangelicals.

Fox-Genovese applauds many of the changes that the women's movement and "second-wave feminism" have achieved for women in the United States. However, she maintains that these achievements have come at an exorbitantly high cost to families and children. She acknowledges that current women's standing is closely related to a larger social transformation caused by the elevation of individual rights to the highest status in society. Further, Fox-Genovese submits that the obsessive preoccupation with equality between the sexes and with monitoring its progress or regress is distracting us from the nature and magnitude of the social change that is engulfing us.

She also points out that the lack of a common or shared faith and a public agnosticism is evidence of the loss of a moral code that can hold society together. The families, and particularly children, are the big losers. The mores that once sheltered women also protected children. In particular, she criticizes religious women for relinquishing the virtues of service and self-sacrifice and for embracing a spirituality that often conflicts with church teachings against abortion and support of lifelong marriage.

In addition, she asserts that privacy of the individual has taken primacy over the rights and responsibility of married couples and families. Fox-Genovese suggests that in order to overcome the excesses of individualism there must be a Christian understanding of sexual differences and human equality. This is best accomplished by recognizing that women and men complement one another, and they have joint stewardship of the children.

Her three respondents all agree that the philosophy of radical individualism undermines the institutions of marriage and the family and is detrimental to children. However, they disagree with Fox-Genovese on some of her assumptions.

Grenz (2000) applauds Fox-Genovese for emphasizing the recovery of an ethic of self-sacrifice. However, he maintains that such an ethic should not have to be realized by women alone. Instead of elevating certain gender roles to a normative status, he proposes the need for a more flexible understanding of role differentiation. Grenz emphasizes that Christian women and men share a new covenant by way of their unity in Christ.

Keyes (2000) agrees with Genovese that Biblical marriage is not a social contract but a lifelong covenant, which at times may require partners to make unequal sacrifices. She disagrees with Fox-Genovese, who she understands as implying that there is a causal connection between "equality" and reducing marriage to a mere contract. Keyes argues that in Christian marriage, equality is consistent with a wholehearted, 100-percent giving to each other throughout their lives.

This respondent maintains that the Bible is silent about gender roles. She disagrees with Fox-Genovese's idea of motherhood as women's special vocation, so that it is more harmful for the children when mothers, rather than fathers, work outside the home. Keyes points to the overwhelming evidence that fathers' absence or neglect of children contributes to social problems. Keyes' arguments seem to be worthy of consideration. However, there are several passages concerning gender roles in the

Bible. It is the different interpretations of these "problem passages" which have caused the debate.

Van Leeuwen (2000) contrasts Fox-Genovese's arguments with Abraham Kuyper's critique on individualism in the late nineteenth century. She points out that Kuyper had valuable insights into the distinct responsibilities and rights of institutions such as the family. He endorsed the advancement of women, including a limited role for women in public life. Nevertheless, van Leeuwen maintains that Kuyper did not overcome the Victorian bourgeois prejudice of assigning women primarily to the domestic sphere. Still, she agrees with Fox-Genovese's criticism of establishment feminists. On the other hand, Van Leeuwen strongly disagrees with Fox-Genovese's claim that Christians who support equality of gender roles have sold out to feminist individualism. She states that there is no single, clear understanding of sexual difference and equality that can be turned into a litmus test of Christian orthodoxy. Van Leeuwen concludes that the key question for all should be about how to put children first, without putting women last, and without putting men on the sidelines.

Finally, all four proponents agree on one thing, that both mothers and fathers need to take their family responsibilities seriously for the sake of their children and for the benefit of one another, both inside and outside the home.

More recently, Gallagher (2003) outlines two perspective within American evangelicalism on the roles of gender, and children within the family: the dominant evangelical view on male headship in the home, and the partnership and egalitarianism promoted by Biblical feminists.

Contrary to the perception that the Evangelical views of gender and family is largely associated with the debate on Biblical inerrancy and doctrinal understanding on gender role, Gallagher (2003) argues that gender ideology is central to the Evangelical ontology. It is fundamentally what evangelicalism is about. The author proposes that the Evangelical views on gender roles are not really based on beliefs

such as Biblical inerrancy. It is more influenced by the opinion of the Evangelical subculture.

Given that the focus of this study is on the context of intercultural marriage, there is reason to believe that the spouses' socialization is likely to have been diverse. The Filipino culture is matriarchal based on its Malay root but patriarchal due to Spanish colonization. Thus, the Filipino gender role is “externally patriarchal but internally matriarchal” (Andres and Andres 1987:4; Zaide 1998:34). Although the spouses are both Evangelicals, they can come from different cultural milieus with their own pattern of role expectations, and experiences (Imamura 1986:37-38; Howell 1979:128). Mutual understanding and adjustment of role expectation is likely to be relevant for the success of the marriage (Imamura 1986b:46).

#### **2.3.4 Divorce and remarriage**

In agreement with his explanation reviewed earlier, Clark (1995:31-32) underlines that the key ethical issue for interpreting the controversial Biblical passages concerning divorce and remarriage is associated with the view on the breakability or unbreakability of the marriage covenant. If a marriage is indissoluble, then a remarriage after divorce constitutes marriage by a married person to someone other than one's spouse. The consummation of this new marriage is by definition adultery. If marriage is dissolvable, then a remarriage after divorce is a marriage by a single person, and thus by definition it is not adultery. He maintains that the fundamental assumption concerning the dissolvability of marriage colors exegesis and influences the view one takes. Protestants consider faithful monogamy as the ideal, and Roman Catholics view anything less as sinful. Divorce is conceded or permitted, but never commanded. Nevertheless, he acknowledges that divorce is one way to protect the victims of spousal neglect, irresponsibility, abuse, or betrayal. Concessions are necessary when considering difficult cases where one spouse is victimized by the other.

In any case, divorce is still a controversial issue among Evangelicals. There are four main positions concerning divorce and remarriage. House (1990), presents a debate among the four views. They are represented by theologians: (1) Carl Laney for "No divorce and no remarriage", (2) William A Heth for "Divorce but no remarriage", (3) Thomas R. Edgar for "Divorce and remarriage for adultery or desertion", and (4) Larry Richards for "Divorce and remarriage under a variety of circumstances".

The debate centers around the interpretation of certain key passages in the Bible, for instance: Gen 2:24, Dt 24:1-4, Matt 19:3-12 (particularly v. 9), 1 Cor 7 (primarily vs. 5, 10, 11, and 15). These writers explain their position based on the relevant passages, and they also present a case example to clarify the application of their point of view.

#### 2.3.4.1 "No divorce and no remarriage"

Laney submits his conclusion on the basis of his survey of the major scriptural passages on marriage, divorce and remarriage as follows: 1. The original creative intention and will of God is that marriage be permanent until death. 2. Neither God himself nor God through Moses commanded divorce. 3. The explanation in the NT for allowing divorce refers to the OT, the hardness of the people's hearts, or hearts unsubmitted to the restraints of a high and holy God. 4. Paul asserts that the fundamental teachings of Jesus must be followed precisely, that the wife should not leave her husband and that the husband should not divorce his wife. 5. Remarriage is permissible without sin for a widow or widower, if the marriage is to another believer. 6. Remarriage following divorce, by either the husband or wife, constitutes an act of adultery. 7. Marriage to a divorced person constitutes an act of adultery. 8. When a divorce does occur, the only two scriptural options for the divorced person are either reconciliation or the single life.

In addition, Laney argues that if a Biblical view on divorce and remarriage were taught in today's churches, marriage would be entered into with greater caution and partners would commit themselves to making their marriage work. Thus, marriages

would be stronger and longer lasting, if divorce were not viewed as a way out of difficult relationship (Laney 1990:48).

#### 2.3.4.2 “Divorce but no remarriage”

Heth (1990) agrees with Laney on two points. First, individual cases must be considered in the light of Scripture. In other words, Scripture is a revelation of God's character and will. These should never be made to conform to human personal preferences. He also concurs with Laney that people need not be afraid of truth. Ignorance can hurt us. Heth maintains that each of the positions have weaknesses. Therefore, there must be openness.

Further, both Laney and Heth underline the importance of the meaning of marriage paradigm expressed in Gen 2:24. In Matt 19:9, a verse often quoted by Evangelicals to draw their position on the issue, Jesus was referring to Gen 1 and Gen 2. Also, Paul refers to the same teaching of Gen 2:24. Both Laney and Heth agree that the words "leave" and "cleave" in Gen 2:24 present the idea of marriage as a covenant between a man and a woman with God as the witness.

Heth credits Laney's practical insights on what these concepts mean for marriage today, such as the problem of husband or wife who are still being bound emotionally to the authority of their parents. He expresses his appreciation for Laney's insight. He refers to Laney's statement: "You or I might have used the word "love" in place of "cleave" in Gen 2:24, but that the concept of "cleave" in the OT would be less affected by changes in feeling and emotions. Thus, both these scholars affirm that marriage could be defined as God's act of joining a man and a woman in a permanent, covenanted, one-flesh relationship. Moreover, they believe that this indicates that a new family or kinship unit begins with every marriage.

The two theologians interpret Dt 24:1-4 as not instituting divorce, but merely treating it as a practice already known and existing. This passage does not change God's original plan for the permanence of marriage.

Some Evangelicals argue for the right to divorce by appealing to Ezra 9 and 10. A few mention that God even commands divorce in some circumstances. Laney and Heth concur in saying that it is precarious to draw such conclusions from this passage.

Heth and Laney jointly oppose the view that Matt 19:3-12 allows remarriage after divorce for immorality. They maintain that this interpretation is contextually incongruent both with the context proceeding v. 9 and with vs. 10-12. Besides, it would be difficult to justify such an interpretation with Jesus' divorce sayings elsewhere in the Gospels.

However, Heth parts opinion with Laney's conclusion that there was absolutely no remarriage after divorce based on Matt 19:9 except in cases which constitute an illegal, incestuous marriage. Heth adds that in terms of contemporary application this interpretation amounts to an absolute prohibition of divorce no matter what the circumstances are. In contrast, Heth would not prohibit separation or legal divorce in cases when the husband physically abuses the wife, or commits incest with the children, or was promiscuously adulterous (Heth, in House 1990:59).

Further, based on grammar, Heth and Laney understand Dt 24:1-4 and 1 Cor 7:5 and Jesus' prohibition of divorce as indicating adultery as a single action, rather than a continuous behavior.

Heth submits that, except for a few minor details, he agrees with Laney about the teaching of 1 Cor 7. Vs. 15 and 39 do not sanction remarriage to the deserted believer. Paul does not speak to this issue at all here.

In short, the main difference between Heth and Laney is in how to interpret the clause in Matt 19:9. Consequently, they differ in the understanding of what this verse says or does not say about permissibility of divorce without the right to remarry. For

Laney there is no divorce and no remarriage, but for Heth there can be divorce, but there is no remarriage (Heth, in House 1990:55-60).

#### 2.3.4.3 “Divorce and remarriage for adultery and desertion”

Like Laney and Heth, Edgar agrees that divorce and remarriage should be based on Scripture and not on experience or our own ideas. He also believes that God originally intended for marriage to be permanent, and that this is a desirable goal. He also maintains that the scriptural evidence is against the concept that in a mixed marriage (believer and unbeliever), the believer should divorce the unbelieving spouse (1 Cor 7). He concurs with Laney that Mal 2:14 intends to discourage divorce. He adds that it refers to at least improper divorce discussed in the context.

However, Edgar opposes Laney, who conceives Matt 19:9 as meaning "incestuous marriage". For this idea, Laney alluded to Jesus being in the territory of Herod Antipas at the time. Herod married his brother's wife. Edgar emphasizes that the most reasonable interpretation of "porneia" in Matt 19:9 (and 5: 32) is "adultery". The only other reasonable interpretation is to understand “porneia” in the general sense of illicit sex. Edgar concludes that in Matt 19:9, Jesus teaches that adultery is the one completely valid basis for divorce that allows for remarriage.

He maintains that Jesus' statement in Matt 19:9 refers to one situation where it is proper to initiate the severance of the marriage. The other situation, described in 1 Cor 7:15, is one where the spouse initiates the separation. Here the one abandoned may carry out the legal technicalities for divorce. The unbelieving spouse leaves the believer.

However, the difference of opinion is about the permission for the believer to remarry. The question is whether the statement "The believer is not bound" means merely not bound to stay with the unbeliever, or it means not bound in the sense of being freed from the marriage. Thus, he/she is free to remarry. He maintains that

many of the arguments used against the exception in 1 Cor 7:15 are the same as those used against the exception in Matt 19:9.

The writer states that Paul definitely states the position on divorce and remarriage in 1 Cor 7:10-11 as being given by the Lord. Jesus spoke specifically on the subject of divorce and remarriage in the case described in Matt 19:3-12 (Mk 10:2 -12), and to some extent in Matt 5:32. Therefore, Matt 19:9 (and 5:32) must be the instance to which Paul refers. Edgar also discusses his position on 1 Cor 7:10-11 in great detail. Ultimately, Edgar's position affirms that valid divorce and valid remarriage are permissible, such as in the case of adultery, or desertion.

#### 2.3.4.4 "Divorce and remarriage under a variety of circumstances"

Richard's position (in House 1990:242-245) is summarized in the following points:

1. God's goal in marriage is a lifelong union, within which two people love one another and enrich one another's life. Successful lifelong marriage is possible for any two people willing to follow Jesus' guidelines for a supportive personal relationship (Matt 18).
2. Human beings are marred by sin. Therefore, it is not always possible for a marriage to achieve this ideal. In some cases, hard-heartedness may distort the marriage to a point where a divorce is the best one can do.
3. Hard-heartedness may be in a variety of forms, such as mental, or physical, or sexual abuse, repeated adulteries, and emotional and spiritual abandonment of the relationship. Abandonment can occur even when the partners stay in the same house. In this case, the marriage covenant may have been abandoned regardless whether they have filed a legal divorce or not.
4. It is the sole responsibility of the spouses to determine whether or not the marriage is really over and it is time to divorce. No ecclesiastical court has ever been granted the Biblical right to determine who can or cannot divorce.

However, spiritual leaders are responsible to give guidance and to enable those who are willing to keep trying to love their spouses in Jesus' way.

5. Persons who divorce for any reason do have the right to remarry. Spiritual leaders are responsible to lead them to accept responsibility for the failure of the first marriage, to confess the sin involved to God, and to enter another marriage only upon the clear and definite leading of God.

6. Divorcees who are remarried have the right to be fully involved in the life of the local church, without prejudice. Their spiritual gifts are to be recognized and affirmed, and they are to be encouraged to find the place of service according to their gifts.

Further, Richards presents suggestions for spiritual leaders in counseling those who are considering divorce and those who are considering remarriage. He argues that the persons who are divorcing or remarrying must be treated with compassion and love, confrontation, and by offering emotional support. He proposes that this manner of treating the issue will serve as a witness to the church and to the world of the grace of God. Thus, Richards' position is that of divorce and remarriage under a variety of circumstances.

More concisely, Clark and Rakestraw (1996:226) present the essence of the Evangelical debate on the issue of divorce and remarriage in two common views. They point out that the major evangelical views are built on a common set of important Biblical texts. The fundamental text is Gen 2:24-25, stating Adam and Eve's union as husband and wife in a permanent one-flesh relationship. Added to that, Dt 24:1-4 presents the basis for exceptions to marriage permanence.

It is on the basis of the interpretation of Dt 24:1-4, that the Pharisees tried to trap Jesus in Matt 19:3. Also, scholars debate the meaning and applicability of the exceptional clause of Matt 19:9: "except for marital unfaithfulness". The problem is

in the use of the word “porneia” that can apply to all kinds of sexual sin in general, whereas the usual word for adultery is “moicheia”. Moreover, there is a problem in the understanding of the application of the exceptional clause. If the clause does not apply to the next phrase: “marries another”, then one could divorce an unfaithful spouse, but remarriage is not permitted. To the contrary, if the clause applies to the next phrase, then one could divorce an unrepentantly adulterous spouse and remarry.

The authors also opine that in reality divorce is always less ideal. The Scripture clearly commands faithful monogamy as the ideal. Divorce is conceded or permitted, but never required. It is one way to protect the victims of spousal neglect, irresponsibility, abuse, or betrayal. However, sometimes the less guilty spouse focuses on the technical details of the law in order to get out of the marriage lawfully (Clark and Rakestraw 1996:228).

Apart from the debates among Evangelical theologians on the issue of divorce and remarriage, the following authors are some examples from the field of Evangelical marriage counseling.

Collins (1988) recognizes that Biblical scholars themselves are divided in their conclusions regarding divorce. He classifies them into four categories (Collins 1988:451--454):

1. Those who conclude that marriage is for life. Divorce is not permitted on Biblical grounds. Remarriage after divorce is regarded as adultery (Laney 1981).
2. The second group believes that there are legitimate Biblical grounds for divorce, and remarriage is permitted under these circumstances (Adams 1981).
3. The third position contends that some circumstances in marriage arise that defies solution. Divorce becomes necessary for the sake of the mental,

emotional, or physical health of one of the spouses or their children. This conclusion is based less on specific Biblical teaching, and more on general Biblical principles (Joiner, 1983).

4. The fourth view is largely held by Roman Catholic writers. Under certain conditions a church court can annul a marriage. In this case, the persons are free to remarry (Zwack 1983; cf. Clark 1995).

Further, Collins (1988:451-452) believes that the Bible presents marriage as a permanent union between a husband and a wife (Gen 2:18-25; Matt 19:5; Mark 10:2-12; 1 Cor 7:39). He maintains that this is God's unchanging ideal. However, since the fall of human beings into sin, they have lived on a sub ideal level. The Bible recognizes this condition, and Dt 24:1-4 is the result of this reality. Dt 24:1-4 presents a brief guideline for the practice associated with divorce. Although this passage tolerates divorce, it does not command, nor encourage it. He acknowledges that the meaning of the word "uncleanness" in the passage is a subject for debate. In his opinion, Jesus seems to have agreed to "sexual infidelity" as its meaning (Matt 5:31-32; 19:3-9).

He refers to the teaching of Jesus as reaffirming the permanence of marriage. Divine permission for divorce was granted only because of human sinfulness. It was not God's ideal. Sexual immorality was the only legitimate cause for divorce (Matt 19:9; Lk 16:18). Nonetheless, even in the case of unfaithfulness, divorce is not commanded. It is permitted. Forgiveness and reconciliation are still preferable to divorce. However, many Biblical scholars agree that in the case of divorce due to adultery, the innocent party may remarry. Also, the teaching of Paul echoes Jesus' teaching and adds a second permissible cause for divorce, desertion by an unbelieving mate (1 Cor 7:17).

Based on the discussion of Dt 24:2, Matt 5:32, Matt 19:9, and 1 Cor 7:15, he maintains that most Bible-believing Christians agree that God intended marriage to be

a permanent and exclusive union between a man and woman, who find their sexual fulfillment within marriage. Divorce is not commanded, nor encouraged in Scripture. It is permissible on two grounds: when one's mate is guilty of sexual immorality and is unwilling to repent (Matt 19:9). Also, when one's mate is an unbeliever, who willfully and permanently deserts the believing partner (1 Cor 7:15).

Thus, no Christian should aggressively seek divorce. He concedes that there are extreme cases, when against the wishes and efforts of the committed mate; the marriage is dissolved beyond human ability to restore it. In this case, God in his grace allows divorce. He maintains that many Biblical scholars are of the opinion that if possibility of reconciliation has been exhausted and the marriage ends, remarriage "in the Lord" is allowed.

The author adds three additional comments. First, he maintains that the Bible does not present specific divine guidelines for non-believers who divorce. Consequently, many Evangelicals would agree that an individual who was married and divorced prior to becoming a believer is free to remarry after conversion of faith. Second, he emphasizes the importance of forgiveness. God hates divorce (Mal 2:16) and forbids adultery (Ex 20:14; Matt 5:27-28). However, these are not unpardonable sins. Third, he mentions a number of destructive behaviors such as, violence, physical and mental abuse, deviant forms of sexual behavior (including forced incest), foul language, failure to provide for a family's physical needs, alcoholism, a refusal to let other family members worship and so forth. These behaviors can cause emotional, physical and mental anguish. Thus, some mates try to defend themselves and their children and believe that it will be better to try to survive elsewhere than to stay in the marriage.

He admits that the Bible seems to be silent on this issue. Scholars disagree, whether these situations justify divorce. In itself, abuse does not seem to be an accepted Biblical cause for divorce, even though some divorces occur because of it. Neither does the Bible encourage separation, though it recognizes that this can happen. Often

temporary separation may be needed for the physical, psychological and spiritual well being of the abused mate and family members. Sometimes such a separation can help the hard-hearted person to come to repentance and to reconciliation.

Thompson (1989) is written by a pastor and Christian counselor for other pastors and Christian counselors, to help them understand some of the dynamics of divorce. The author outlines some intervention strategies to help salvage a troubled marriage. He also states that ultimately, the book deals with a Christian response to the divorced and the divorcing (Thompson 1989:12).

The author argues that there are some theological problems with divorce. These relate to the Christian doctrines of sin and grace and the marriage covenant. He points out that the problem with so many theological theories on divorce is that they are hard to apply in the counselor's office. Many theological theories only address the issue of abandonment and adultery in divorce. A large percentage of the divorcing and the divorced have not been abandoned nor have their mates committed adultery against them.

He proposes that theologians struggle with judicial issues of guilt or innocence, hoping to maintain the purity of the church and to prevent divorce. Pastors struggle with the consequences of immorality, hoping to restore couples to spiritual and psychological wholeness. It is not enough to portray the ideal. In other words, we must come to grips with the reality. Thompson suggests that we have to examine our theology of sin and grace as it applies to divorce. (Thompson 1989:49).

Furthermore, the writer suggests that covenant breaking is the real sin associated with divorce. At the same time, he refers to Small (1986:50-51), who expresses that a marriage can die. This happens when spouses walk away from the covenant's obligations. It is a repudiation of the covenant. Internal repudiation precedes the more visible external conflict. Often, some time prior to that, there have been

faithless actions and attitudes. Divorce is merely giving a decent burial to the marriage that died or was murdered.

In regards to remarriage, Thompson refers to Duty (1967:127-128), Adams (1980:24-25), and Small (1986:193-194). Duty claims exceptions are permitted for remarriage for the innocent party. That is in marriage that ends in divorce due to adultery or abandonment. Adams and Small argue that remarriage is possible once the marriage covenant is broken by divorce, and offenders seek forgiveness for their action, regardless whether the divorce occurs on Biblical grounds or not. Both Adams and Small believe that God's grace is greater than the sin of divorce. Divorce is not an "unpardonable sin" (Thompson 1989:53-54).

### **2.3.5 Conservative or liberal view of marriage and family**

Wilson et al. (1997) assess the degree to which conservative Protestants are a distinct minority when it comes to family behavior. The researchers define conservative Protestants by combining denominational affiliation with the responses to doctrinal belief items and self-identification items. They refer to Stacey (1990), who raises the possibility that a good number of conservative Protestants would exhibit what she calls "postmodern" family behavior. In other words, these people find it relatively easy to adapt conservative teachings to their family needs. However, in the overall result of their study, Wilson et al. (1997:185-186) find that conservative Protestants are actually less likely to exhibit "the post-modern" forms of behavior tested, than more liberal Protestants. They add that the differences are most marked where the measure of conservatism is self-identification, and least marked where the importance of the Bible is used as a measure.

Wilson et al. try to describe the difference between Fundamentalists and Evangelicals among Protestants in relation to "self-identification". They submit that Fundamentalism can be considered as a subgroup within Evangelicalism (Kellsted and Smidt 1991:260; Wilson et al. 1997:186).

They maintain that Social Scientists, Evangelicals as well as Fundamentalists mostly perceive Fundamentalists as more conservative, and more dogmatic, than Evangelicals on a wide range of issues (Wilcox 1986b:357; Wilson 1997:186). Moreover, Fundamentalists accuse Evangelicals of being too tolerant of "modernism" and permissive behaviors. Fundamentalists are more anxious to separate themselves from nonbelievers and associate with like-minded people than Evangelicals (Jelen 1987; Wilson et al. 1997:186). Also, Fundamentalists are more likely to see their family as one way of living out their convictions as fundamentalists.

Evangelicals who do not share the Fundamentalists' sense of separateness and rejection of the "world" are swept under the heading of "conservative Protestant". As mentioned earlier, "conservative Protestants are less likely to show "post-modern" forms of behavior than "liberal Protestants" (Wilson et al. 1997:186).

The second interpretation perceives "self-identification" as the effect rather than as the cause of family behavior. Some people become members, or turn to be more zealous conservative Protestant denomination members, because they need to legitimize and find support for their more traditional family behaviors. They are most likely to identify themselves as Fundamentalists. This self-identification variable comes closest to measuring the subculture dimension of fundamentalism (Wilson et al. 1997:186).

Added to that, Wilson et al. conclude that their data suggest that feminism has not penetrated the ranks of Fundamentalism. They identify this subgroup of church people as those who are most opposed to change, regardless of their social class position (Wilson et al. 1997:187).

Another study, Brinkerhoff and Mackie (1985, in Bahr 1991) compares the findings of research on U. S. and Canadian students' attitudes concerning religion and gender.

They found that increased religiosity led to increases in traditional attitude in both groups.

### **2.3.6 Conclusion**

Apart from the issues of hermeneutics, the different Evangelical views on husband and wife's role, the permanence of marriage, and divorce and remarriage in America can be influenced by the different degrees and shades of the persons' religiosity and personal experience.

However, Evangelicals generally agree that marriage is Biblically a covenant made before God. Nonetheless, they can differ in their view on its permanence and the concession for divorce and remarriage. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic Church has one official position, which is marriage as a sacrament. Divorce is not possible, but a church court can decide according to a set of rules whether annulment can be granted, whereby remarriage is legally permitted. In the predominantly Roman Catholic Philippines, divorce is not permitted, and legal codes on separation and annulment lean on the sacramental view.

Literature on intercultural marriage of Filipinas with foreign men of various nationalities only considers Roman Catholic Filipinas' religiosity, and that it is a salient factor, which supports or keeps them in the marriage (Samonte 1992; 1994; Bauzon 1999; Simmons 2001). Also, with German - Filipina couples, where both spouses and the German in-laws are similarly devout Roman Catholics, the Filipina wives fit-in easily into the family and the community. However, when the husbands are not religious, the religiosity of the wives is either tolerated or can become a problem for the marriage (Beer 1996:226-227).

The participants of this study are Evangelical intercultural couples. They attend their church regularly, and identify themselves as committed Evangelical Christians. The fieldwork investigates how Biblical teaching and church participation influence both

the husbands' and the wives' views on covenant marriage commitment, divorce and remarriage, and adjustment in their role of husband and wife.

## **2.4 Mainstream Philippine cultural values**

There are many cultural features in the Philippines and in North America, which are limited to particular regional, ethnic, religious or social circumstances.

Therefore, by using the words "mainstream" and "salient", the purpose is to focus on the most common dominant values of the people in the Philippine and in North American society, which can be construed as part of the cultural identity of the Filipinos and North Americans in general.

The issue of differences in cultural values is of utmost significance in the discussion of intercultural couples. Romano (2001:37-38) writes:

*Values indicate what matters, what is seen as good and bad, right and wrong true and false, important and unimportant. Values tell us much about who we are, what we believe in, and how we will behave and evaluate behavior.*

In relation to other cultures, Panopio and Rolda (2000:55) state:

*Values indicate the moral imperatives, and social conscience of social control, internalized by the individual members of the society. They direct people on what should or should not be done, and how to choose. Values of different cultures are diverse, so that what is held as desirable by one group may be looked down upon by another.*

More philosophically Rokeach (1973:25) writes:

*To say that a person has a value is to say that he has an enduring prescriptive or proscriptive belief that a specific mode of behavior end-state of existence is*

*preferred to a specific mode of behavior or end-state. This belief transcends attitudes toward objects and toward situations; it is a standard that guides and determines actions, attitude toward objects and situations, ideology, presentations of self to others, evaluations, judgments, justifications, comparisons of self with others, and attempts to influence others. Values serve adjustive ego-defensive, knowledge, and self-actualizing functions.*

Thus, intercultural couples' marriage commitment and adjustment involve coming to terms with cultural value differences. It follows that the first part of this section on the literature review will be dedicated to the discussion of Filipino values and the second will concentrate on those of North America.

The main topics in part I are (1) Filipino core values and children's upbringing, (2) gender role expectation, (3) modernization and changes in values, (4) Filipino values among the Filipinos in North America, and (5) conclusion. Part II will continue with discussing North American values, specifically (6) North American dominant values, (7) social class differences in values, (8) changes in traditional values and gender roles, and (9) conclusion.

#### **2.4.1 Filipino core values and children's upbringing**

This review will discuss the relevant dominant Filipino traditional values "SIR" (Smooth Interpersonal Relationship), "utang na loob" (reciprocity or debt of gratitude), "hiya" (embarrassment or shame), "amor propio" (self-esteem), the bilateral kinship and extended family ties and the value of children, and children's upbringing.

#### 2.4.1.1 The value of “SIR” and “Pakikisama”

Lynch (1962) defines "SIR"(Smooth Interpersonal Relationship) as a facility of getting along with others in such a way as to avoid outward signs of conflict. It means being agreeable, even under difficult circumstances. In other words, it is keeping quiet over a conflict, or keeping it out of sight (Lynch 1962:89). "SIR" is acquired and preserved principally by "pakikisama" (going along with the group), euphemism and the use of a mediator.

"Pakikisama" involves giving in to the will of the leader or majority in order to reach unanimous decisions. It is because no one likes a holdout. Added to that, euphemism is stating an unpleasant truth, opinion or request as pleasantly as possible. Hence, one does this with a low voice and gentle manner along with a courteous speech. In fact, when one acts contrary to “SIR” and “pakikisama”, the result is “hiya” (shame). Therefore, a mediator is used to preserve or to restore smooth interpersonal relationship. The go-between functions to avoid embarrassing request, complaint, decision, or "hiya" (shame) of face-to-face encounters. The mediator also remedies an existing state of conflict or tension. These Filipino values are contrary to North American sense of independence, truthfulness and directness.

In his 1973 edition, Lynch adds that one should not expect these values to be uniquely found among the Filipinos. For examples, "SIR" may also be found in American culture, but the conception of social acceptance is emphasized differently. Americans would rate integrity ("let your speech express your mind") higher than interpersonal tranquility. On the other hand, Lynch maintains that the Filipino does not see the reason why conflict should not be avoided. The Filipino would consider silence or evasive speech, or using euphemism as preserving peace. In Lynch (1973 a), the author explains that Americans prefer to clarify points of disagreement as a prelude to discussion and "agreement to disagree". Filipinos seek harmony by blurring of differences and by "agreement not to disagree openly".

This value difference also appeared in our study on Filipina-North American couples. The wives resorted to silence when they were upset, whereas their husbands tried to approach their wives to clarify the issue.

The author elaborates that the ability and importance of getting along well with others are ranked higher in the Philippine value system than in the American society. He also states that more recent studies concluded that "SIR" is more salient in certain kinds of people than in others. Although other groups of people also hold "SIR" as important, it seems to be more pronounced among the rural, lower class, poorly educated, traditional, employees and men.

Further, "SIR" seems to have distinct application in different relationships. Church (1986) presents a review on a large number of studies of Filipino personality completed since the nineteen sixties. The review presents an augmented discussion of "SIR" (smooth interpersonal relationship). It refers to Hollnsteiner (1969), who points out that even where "non-SIR" behavior exists in Filipinos, it does not contradict the "SIR" thesis. It is consistent with the sense of segmentation and solidarity. Filipinos see each other as: 1. Enemies. 2. Acquaintances and friendly strangers. 3. Close friends, family, and in-group members. "SIR" applies to the group of acquaintances and friendly strangers. Frankness is more acceptable among family and close friends. Guthrie (1961) also mentioned that there is a marked distinction in the application of "utang na loob" and "amor propio" in family and non-family affairs

#### 2.4.1.2 The value of "amor propio"

Lynch (1962) discusses "amor propio" (self-esteem). He describes this value as sensitivity to personal affront. Unlike "SIR", which is more focused on the attainment and enhancement of social acceptance, "amor propio" serves to retain social acceptance. The person jealously guards his claim for respect and esteem (Lynch 1962:98).

Further, Church (1986) reviews the significance of "amor propio" (self-esteem) referring to the writing of Batacan (1956), Fox (1956), Lynch (1973a) and Guthrie (1968). "Amor propio" means a "keen sense of personal dignity", or "sensitivity to personal affront". These writers maintain that "amor propio" has as key element the need to be treated as a person. It concerns aspects of "personal dignity", "honor", "self-respect" and "pride". However, it can also be viewed negatively as over-sensitivity and a fragile sense of personal worth. This tendency causes vulnerability to criticism and insults, whether real or imaginary.

Furthermore, Jocano (1997) purposes to describe the core elements of the Filipino traditional value system, and to present an alternative interpretation of the core values consistent with local knowledge and cultural experiences. He analyzes the concept of "asal" (a standard of Filipino system of valuing). "Asal" is associated with "sets of dominant and commonly shared values and norms, which Filipinos use as points of reference in expressing themselves, interpreting the actions of others, and in regulating interpersonal and intergroup relations" (Jocano 1997:52). Three central principles of the concept of "asal" are the essence of "kapwa" (relational standard), "damdamin" (emotional standard), and "dangal" (moral standard).

"Kapwa" (relational standard) highlights the importance of harmonious relationship. The Filipino cultural orientation is relational, group oriented or collectivistic, interdependent, and familistic. "Damdamin" (emotional standard) accounts for personalism, subjectivism, and sentimentalism of the Filipinos. Jocano placed the concept of "hiya" (shame or reluctance to interact), "amor propio" (self-esteem or self-pride) and "delicadeza" (behaving properly) as parts of "damdamin" (emotional standard).

Both "delicadeza" and "amor propio" are to protect a person from losing face. Losing face is felt as losing personal dignity as an individual and as a member of the group. Thus, the essence of "damdamin" seems contrary to North American directness, frankness and "bottom line" attitude.

"Dangal" (moral standard) includes knowledge of what is considered morally right, feeling what is morally good and acting in a way that is morally desirable. Jocano proposes that to have "dangal" is to have a sterling character, which is firm in conviction and fair in judgment. Therefore, he concludes that such a person does not transgress the "kapwa" principle. One does not hurt the "damdamin" of others, but shows concern for others' feeling (1997:79). A good Filipino is to be supportive of the group ideals, not to hurt the feelings of others, and is concerned of fulfilling social obligations to each other in the community (1997:83). Thus, social customs are important.

#### 2.4.1.3 The value of "hiya"

Lynch (1962) proposes that in the display of courtesy, the person gains or enhances his/her acceptance as a good member of society. Failing to behave as expected brings about social sanction of shame ("hiya"). Lynch explains "hiya" as the uncomfortable feeling that accompanies awareness of being in a socially unacceptable position or acting socially unacceptably. Those who violate socially approved norms of conduct are condemned as "walang hiya" (shameless).

Bulatao (1964) contributes further with the study on "hiya" (shame or embarrassment). The author presents cases to illustrate how "hiya" (shame) and "walang hiya" (no shame) are applied. Bulatao concludes that hiya can mean "shyness", "timidity", "embarrassment" and "sensitivity" rather than shame. "Hiya" does not occur because of the wrong done, but it is experienced over the revelation of it. He adds that the American's sense of "I am ashamed of myself" has a different meaning to the Filipino's "hiya". The latter has a sense of "I am ashamed to you". Thus, "hiya" is closer to "embarrassment" than to shame. Therefore, the author tentatively defines "hiya" as a painful emotion arising from a relationship with an authority figure or with society, inhibiting self-assertion in a situation, which is perceived as dangerous to one's ego. It is a kind of anxiety or fear of experiencing one's ego exposed, unprotected and unaccepted. (Bulatao 1964:428).

Also, the concept of "hiya" (shame or embarrassment) seems to suggest the tendency toward group dependence. Church (1986:49-54) refers to the extensive studies of Bulatao (1964, 1964b, 1966b) on this concept. Bulatao associates "hiya" with Filipino "undifferentiated ego". Security is not found within the self, but it is embedded in the group. Thus, one element, which springs from "hiya", is over-sensitivity to what others will say. "Hiya" is a concept of central importance in the patterning of the Filipino child's behavior (Church 1986:51). The threat of shame is held over the child to obtain the approved behavior.

Consequently, beside the consideration of the geographical distance, the study on Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands is mindful of "hiya" in deciding on the method and manner of interviewing the participants by phone, instead of by a face-to-face encounter with the participants.

#### 2.4.1.4 The value of "utang na loob"

Another important Filipino value is "utang na loob" (reciprocity, or debt of gratitude). Hollnsteiner (1964) expresses that this value is a universal principle. However, in the Philippines, people are very concerned about getting along with others, so that reciprocity is a constant consideration. The author discusses three types of reciprocity: contractual reciprocity, quasi-contractual reciprocity, and "utang na loob" (debt of gratitude). "Utang na loob" is applied within the family context for instance, in parent-child and sibling relationship. Children are expected to be everlastingly grateful to their parents for all they have done for the children in the process of raising them. More fundamentally, they have a debt of gratitude to their parents for giving them life itself. Particularly, children need to recognize that their mother risked her life to enable each child to exist. Thus, a child's "utang na loob" to its parents is immeasurable and eternal.

In relation to siblings, the younger sibling owes "utang na loob" to all his/her elder siblings. The reason is that the elder siblings have cared for them. In Hollnsteiner's

field study, she found that the local perception was that the older siblings have done a favor even by letting the younger ones be born after them (Hollnsteiner 1964:32).

However, parent-child "utang na loob" relationship is complementary rather than reciprocal. For, parents do not develop "utang na loob" toward their children. It is the duty of parents to rear their children. On the other hand, it is the children's obligation to respect and obey their parents and to show their gratitude by taking care of them in their old age (Hollnsteiner 1964:32).

It is conceivable that this complementary relationship brings about a special closeness among family members. There is a sense of obligation toward mutual support and help. Failure to fulfill the obligation causes deep bitterness as if the sacred bond is broken and the family feels betrayed. The offender has broken trust and is told that he/she is incapable of showing love and respect to parents and elder siblings. The significance of this value is evident in the issue of financial support for the extended family in our study.

Guthrie and Jacobs (1966) suggest that the lesser emphasis on family and kin ties in America is the result of the idea of self-sufficiency. If the American concept of dependency, in the sense of making one's own decisions and accepting individual responsibility for one's actions, were applied to the Filipinos, the latter would seem very dependent. However, Guthrie and Jacobs clarify that Filipino "dependency" is better viewed as closeness, cooperation, respect and duty. This is in consonance with the high value of family sufficiency and reciprocity over self-sufficiency and independence.

Moreover, Church (1986:44) refers to Lynch (1973a), who states that in the American culture, security is sought through independence (standing on one's own feet), whereas for the Filipinos security is achieved through interdependence. Church's review (1986:44) reiterates that Filipinos have a strong need for group identity or belongingness. Individualism and self-reliance are not pursued (Bulatao 1963;

1969b). Lapuz (1977) expands that to be part of, or to belong is the basic need of a Filipino. Thus, “pakikisama” and “utang na loob” appear contrary to North American values of independence and self-reliance.

#### 2.4.1.5 The value of kinship, extended family and children

Filipino family structure, kinship and extended family ties are cogent features of the cultural value, and children are highly valued in the system. Church's literature review (1986:55-56) finds that the close family bond, and bilateral-extended kinship system of the Philippine culture are consistent distinctives in the studies of Pal and Arquiza (1957), Fox (1961), Quisumbing (1963), Guthrie and Jacobs (1966), Guthrie and Azores (1966), Jocano (1966a; 1969a), Guthrie (1971), Ramirez (1971), and Lynch (1973a). In other words, Filipino familism is relevant and persistent.

Likewise, Hart (1980) explains the bilateral social system as very prominent in the Philippine culture. The author summarizes three "structural" features of lowland Filipino kinship, which includes Tagalog and Bisayan regions.

Note: The "highland" stands for the remote rural areas that have little contact with foreigners. The "lowland" has constant exchange with foreigners.  
Tagalog is the Northern part of Philippines where Tagalog is spoken.  
Bisayan/Visayan region is the central and Southern part where the Bisayan language is predominant.

The three features are: bilateral, generational hierarchy and respect for seniority (Hart 1980:774). However, he does not mention gender hierarchy. Hart maintains that the paucity of sex-specific kinship terms for lowland Christian Filipinos often blurs the actual inequality of the sexes. In his view, in comparison with South and East Asians, the role equality of Filipinas seems impressive. He states that evidence suggests that there was even more equality of the two sexes in the pre-Hispanic Philippine society.

Filipino familism and social life are also the focus of Andres and Andres (1987). The authors aim at helping foreigners understand the Filipino culture. They discuss values associated with religious belief, family and kinship, and women's role. Andres and Andres (1987:39-43) present eighteen features of Filipino familism that can be summarized as follows:

1. The nuclear family is the basic unit of corporate action.
2. The interests of the individual are secondary to those of the family.
3. Marriage is an alliance of two families. It is a permanent contract. Divorce is not recognized, although legal separation is permitted in cases of adultery, and when one spouse tries to kill the other.
4. An offense against one member of the family is perceived as a threat to the whole family.
5. Familial ties are not broken by marriage, distance of residence, or change in social status of a family member.
6. Both custom and the Civil Code provide for mutual support among members of the family. To abandon or ignore the plight of a family member reflects dishonorably on the family.
7. Generally, the residence of a family is with the paternal kin that is near or in the area of the parents of the husband. However, variations are possible by virtue of the land they own, and the number of siblings.
8. Filipino households can consist of one elementary family joined by one or more close relatives, for instance, a widowed parent, unmarried siblings, or members of the family abandoned by their spouses.
9. The husband and the wife are still integral members of their own family of origin. Thus, if a husband abuses his wife, her kinsmen will intervene.
10. The Filipino family is externally patriarchal but internally matriarchal. The mother plays a very active role in the family.
11. There is a separation of the sexes in the family. Young women are to stay home and are taught to hide and control their emotions and thoughts. They are chaperoned when they go out with the opposite sex. Display of emotion in public even between husband and wife is frowned on.

12. Authority is based on age.
13. Thus, the older siblings in the family have authority over the younger.  
This generational respect is evident in the titles placed before the name of an older sibling or relative when addressing them.
14. Filipino family life centers on the children. The family unit is formalized when a child is born to the couple. The child is equally related to the maternal and paternal kin.
15. Family relation is extended to distant cousins, who are to be given help in times of need.
16. Filipino family ties, and obligations are predominantly within the family and kin group, both consanguineous and affined. There is relatively little time for "friendship" and when it does develop, the system of "compadrazco" (ritual kinship) is employed to formalize the relationship.
17. The bond of kinship is relatively secure and predictable. Conversely, a social distance generally separates members of kin and non-kinsmen.
18. The Filipino social system stresses the collective body more than in the Western system. The family is the center of society. The individual finds fulfillment as a person in the context of family and neighborhood.

As to the value of children, Andres (1987:27-31) maintains that analysis of the factors influencing family size preferences, indicated that age, education, and urban or rural residence affect attitudes toward family size. The younger, more educated and urbanized favored moderate rather than large family sizes. Furthermore, several studies have shown that Filipinos are shifting to modern attitudes toward preferences for smaller family.

In spite of the change, studies also show that the large family norm still persists. The motivating factors are the cultural value and belief about children. For example, children are considered as gifts of God. Children bring happiness to parents and siblings and other relatives. Children are economic assets. Children are public evidences of maleness and fulfillment of motherhood. Children are evidence of love

and a strengthening force in marriage and family. Children offer a second chance to have the parents' own ambitions and dreams vicariously satisfied. Children are a fulfillment of parents' and society's expectations. Children are considered as an enhancement of parental prestige. Because children are gifts of providence, God ordains the productivity of procreation by destiny or fate, and God will provide for the cost of raising them.

With regard to the size of family, our study confirms that the Filipinas and their North American husbands have adjusted to the more modern attitude toward the value of children, or they have assimilated to the North American outlook.

The value of children is evident in the system of kinship ties and familism. Matthews (1994) elaborates on the concept of ritual kinship or "compadrazgo". This paper is based on fieldwork in Surigao, an area in Southern Philippines. The author argues that "compadrazgo" in the Philippines is an example, in which children play a central role in kinship relationship. Ritual kinship is nurtured by celebration of birthdays, baptism and so forth. It reaffirms moral bond and social order to the participants. In such a bilateral and extended family system, children are symbolically important. Their birth and the religious and social rituals, which involve their life, nurture the kinship and "compadrazgo" network.

Matthews (1994) proposes that the "compadrazgo" system is performative and normative or instrumental. Filipinos establish, maintain and affirm their notions of personhood and identity by means of having children. Children are reasons for the celebration of community and culture. Therefore, the author deduces that this custom may be the real reason for resistance to family planning programs in the Philippines.

Furthermore, Medina et al. (1996) confirm that the closeness of kinship and extended family bond are currently still strong, regardless of modernization.

Likewise, Jocano's study (1998) reaffirms that the rapid changes in the Philippine community life have neither significantly affected the basic institutions of kinship and the family, nor the Filipino core values and norms.

#### 2.4.1.6 Children's upbringing

In earlier literature, Guthrie (1961) presents a pioneering attempt to study Filipino early childhood socialization. The effort is to contribute to materials on emotional and social patterns of Filipino children with the intention of providing teachers with better understanding of pupils. This is in response to the existing concern that in the Filipino school system, the main language of instruction, and the teaching method used are American. However, the pupils and teachers have been raised in the traditional Filipino cultural environment. Also, students at the teacher's college are trained to teach according to American textbooks.

Therefore, Guthrie submits at least four emphases of American education, which are incongruent in the Filipino context: 1. Each child is to be encouraged to develop at its own rate. 2. Each child is to engage in self-initiated activities. 3. The children are to express themselves even if it may be contrary to good standards. 4. A democratic style of conducting the class, in which the pupils can select projects and work out ways to accomplish them.

Such teaching philosophy is disparate to the upbringing of the teachers and the students. By American standards, Filipino parents are authoritarian and control their children until later age. Children's will must sometimes be broken. They must respond as expected. This is contrary to American self-expression. In other words, in American eyes, Filipino parenting style can be perceived as intrusive and fostering dependency. It disagrees with the emphasis on self-initiated activities. Also, American democratic classroom philosophy encourages children to choose their own projects and to carry them out. However, at home the Filipino children are taught to respect their parents and to seek and accept their opinion uncritically.

However, Guthrie reports that lower class Philippine mothers are more authoritarian than mothers in higher social group. Nonetheless, even the maternal role in the Philippine higher social class is more authoritarian compared to American maternal attitudes (Guthrie 1961:22-23). He also underlines that the value of “utang na loob” (debt of gratitude) and “amor propio” (self-esteem) have a strong impact on the emotional and social development of the Filipino person. He concludes that some of the origins of adult patterns of behavior may lie in the childhood experiences.

Also, religiosity is important in Filipino children's socialization. They are taught to trust in God (Porio, Lynch, and Hollnsteiner 1978). This may have contributed to the religiosity of the intermarried Filipinas as reported in literature on Filipina intercultural marriage. They were socialized from early childhood to be religious.

A more current literature differentiates between the upper and the lower strata of Philippine people. Panopio and Rolda (2000), contend that Filipino children in the upper and middle strata grow up to be dependent, because they have a "yaya" (nanny) to take care of their needs in the absence of their mothers. These mothers are occupied with career, business or social functions. To the contrary, children of the lower classes tend to be more independent. An eight year old in this group can be working as newspaper boy, cigarette vendor and so forth. The girls of the poorer class can be working as laundry maid at a tender age of ten. Even if these girls are not employed, they are their mothers' assistance in the home. They are to take care of their younger siblings and do the household chores in the absence of the mother, who are preoccupied with earning a living (Panopio and Rolda 2000:223-224).

It appears that the understanding of the sense of independence between Guthrie (1961) and Panopio and Rolda (2000) differs in focus. Guthrie seems to focus more on independent thinking and decision making, whereas Panopio and Rolda are more concerned with livelihood. For, even the children, who are independent enough to earn a living on the streets may have to do it in obedience to the control of the parents, or out of sense of debt of gratitude to the family. Nonetheless, both the older

literature (Guthrie 1961) and the more recent literature (Panopio and Rolda 2000) perceives differences between the style of raising children in the lower, the middle and upper strata of society. However, several dominant values exist in all strata, for instance, the value of “SIR”, “pakikisama”, “hiya”, "amor propio", “utang na loob”, and bilateral extended family ties.

## **2.4.2 Gender role**

Gender role in the Philippine culture is both egalitarian and patriarchal. The specific issues mentioned in literature are: machismo or egalitarian, decision-making and children’s discipline, transitions in roles, and feminism.

### **2.4.2.1 Machismo or egalitarian**

Yap (1986) perceives the Filipino "macho" and egalitarian role combination as paradoxical. Her statement agrees with other literature on the Philippine culture regarding Filipino gender role. Andres and Andres (1987:4) state: "The Filipino family is externally patriarchal but internally matriarchal". The authors explain that before the Spanish colonization women in the Philippines enjoyed equality with men. The Filipino woman remains master of the house (Andres and Andres 1987:49). Likewise, Hart (1980) expresses that in comparison with South and East Asians, the role equality of the Filipinas seems impressive. Hart submits that evidence indicates that there was more equality of the two sexes in the pre-Hispanic Philippine society.

Also, Zaide (1998:34) states that the Filipino family has been described as patriarchal in authority. However, "the dictum is more of an illusion than a reality". The mother plays a vital role in decision making in the family. The equality of men and women is an ancient Malay tradition that is still present. The Spanish Catholic tradition came into the Philippines later. Thus, both traditions coexist.

With regard to “machismo”, literature points to the double standard of morality for male and female in the Filipino society. For example, many Filipino men acquire a

"kabit" or "querida" (mistresses). Siring many children from the legal wife and from the mistresses proves maleness. To the contrary, women are to preserve fidelity and chastity (Lapuz 1977; Andres 1987b; Bustos and Espiritu 1996).

Lapuz (1977) discusses five issues of marital problems she has encountered most frequently in her psychiatric practice: the symbiotic marriage as the result of immature personalities, marital infidelity, role-reversal related to male inadequacy as breadwinner, problems with in-laws, and irrational jealousy.

The author postulates that it was not more than a generation ago, when women were indoctrinated to believe that a man is "inherently" polygamous. Thus, women were to anticipate and react to such manly tendency with equanimity and to persevere in their marriage. It stands to reason, that Filipino men support the traditional styles of male-female relationships. However, Filipino women are more inclined to explore the possibilities of an open egalitarian relationship (Lapuz 1977:22).

Dumont (1994) based his writing on ethnographic fieldwork in the Philippines from 1979 to 1993. This paper focuses on women in middle class Filipino households. Two decades after Lapuz (1977), Dumont (1994) still writes about the separate world of husbands and wives. He observes the notable absence of males' responsibility in the home, while the females are always expected to be present and responsible for domesticity. Thus, the home is the domain of women. He added that in the Visayan households he studied, this phenomenon is the same in the lower and the middle class. For the males, home was always a feminized space, whereas women have a considerable degree of "private and domestic autonomy" (Dumont 1994:174-177).

The women in the middle class household can consist of the matron, the younger women and the "helpers" (servants). Beyond the boundary of the home there is the "other woman" (mistress). Also, the roles of the women in the home often vary according to their age. The respect a woman commands, derives from her relative age. Although society views the fact of marriage infidelity as bad, at the same time, it

is accepted as image enhancing and evidence of virility. Even women perceive these illicit relationships and flings as morally reprehensible but realistically unavoidable (Dumont 1994:183).

The author concludes by stating that for a married man, the house is both a refuge and prison. He relinquishes most, if not all domestic authority, to his wife. The "helper" (servant) and the "other woman" (mistress) help define the domestic role of the matron from the margins. The "helper" and the mistresses are challenges that undermine the position of the matron in the domestic unit. This happens as the "helper" competes with the matron in the performance of domestic service, whereas the mistress marginalizes the matron in offering sexual and reproductive services to her husband (Dumont 1994:191).

It is noteworthy to add that the literature is not about Evangelical households. Although the differences of domains of men and women are applicable to Filipino Evangelicals, marital infidelity is against their Evangelical belief. The conviction is evident in the fieldwork of this study on Evangelical intercultural couples.

#### 2.4.2.2 Decision making and children's discipline

Other issues in gender role are, who disciplines the children and who is the breadwinner in the family. Porio, Lynch and Hollnsteiner (1978) report a research of fifteen centers in different localities throughout the Philippines. Among other subjects, the study focuses on: (1) patterns of decision making in the Filipino family, (2) patterns of extra household activities shared by family members, (3) priorities among child-rearing values, and (4) attitudes toward working mothers.

Their findings support the concept of egalitarian decision making of husband and wife. Further, they specify that joint-parental mode exists in three of the six decision-making areas. The couples deliberate as a team in decision making on the disciplining of children, child's education, and family investment. The wife alone is most frequently responsible for handling the household budget and expenditures.

They confirm the report of several earlier studies by Guerrero (1965), Liu and Yu (1968), and Mendez and Jocano (1974).

#### 2.4.2.3 Transitions in roles.

Despite the practice of acquiring mistresses, the Roman Catholic religion does not allow divorce. The Philippine Family Code (1988) does not permit divorce but allows for legal separation, and declaration of annulment. However, those who cannot afford divorce will stay together or will live separately. The "querida" (mistress) system provides a way for meeting affective sexual needs (Go 1993:54).

However, Medina (1991:124-125) perceives that the roles are in transition. The author considers the Filipino gender role perspective as projecting a "double vision" of machismo or egalitarian. She writes that the "macho" male image and patriarchalism brought by the Spaniards, clashes with the egalitarian view. Although women's rights have been recognized by the family code of 1987, there is still double standard. Society does not affirm those rights within family and business relationships. Nonetheless, the roles are changing from a traditional patriarchal perspective to a greater partnership model.

Still, Panopio and Rolda (2000:81) write that families would choose to spend their resources to put sons through higher education, rather than paying for the daughters' educational needs.

Earlier data concerning society's approval of working mothers are mixed. The authors interpret that many men consider working mothers as an affront to their ability to fulfill the husband's primary family role as breadwinner. The husbands who admitted that they need the added income were most likely to approve of the working mother unconditionally. A select minority agreed to the wives' employment for the sake of her happiness (Porio, Lynch, and Hollnsteiner 1978:51).

A study in 1993 reports that women have a higher employment rate in the city than men (Medina 1995:28). Medina reports that among low-income families in Manila in 1993, the wives' income contributed to ninety-five percent of the households. Only five percent of the families studied indicate that the husband is the sole breadwinner. To the contrary, in thirty-three percent of the families, the wife's earning was the sole income (Medina 1995:28). However, the author adds that in spite of this reality, the role reversal or the "house-husband" concept is still unacceptable, because it runs counter to the traditional image of the male breadwinner. Thus, society's expectation concerning the male as breadwinner has not changed significantly from several decades ago.

#### 2.4.2.4 Feminism

Estrada-Claudio (1990) alleges that feminism, as a philosophy of social change is not as obvious in the Philippines as in the West. She adds that it exists in the universities and among social service organizations working with women and abuse issues.

Simmons (2001:188) further explains this view. She writes "It is not that the Filipino women want to reject men as a class but to search for men who embodied an ideal that placed a high priority on compatibility rather than conflict regarding family union". Simmons interviewed prospective international marriage brides and grooms, who utilize marriage agencies. She also interviewed social workers and university professors. Samonte, a well-known researcher, author and professor at the University of the Philippines was one of the persons Simmons interviewed.

Samonte expressed that many Filipino women want a change from the expectation they have been socialized with. In this regard, the feminist revolution is for women. However, she asserted that she had not yet seen it affecting gender relations in the Philippines (Simmons 2001:188). Simmons (2001:181) reports that most female international marriage candidates she interviewed considered feminism as a problem of American women.

The findings of our study show that gender-role adjustment among the Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands is flexible in gender task distribution. It is based on common sense regarding who has the suitable gift and training to perform the functions. However, the couples decide on who is the leader in the home based on their understanding of Biblical teaching on gender role.

### **2.4.3 Modernization and changes in values**

Modernization is very evident in the Philippines. Thus, one may ask how it has brought about changes in the traditional Filipino values. In fact, this question has surfaced several decades ago and literature is still discussing the continuing changes.

Hollnsteiner (1965) presented a paper at a Roman Catholic symposium in Dec. 1965 in Manila, in which the topic of changes and the effects on families were discussed. In it she argues that the basic and important features of the family persist, but not without having integrated some of the modern features. She believes that an enriched new version of the family is obtained by the reorientation of the Filipino outlook on the old order (Hollnsteiner 1965:19). Hollnsteiner is optimistic about the benefits of adaptation to the modern society.

Therefore, she points out the negative sides of various Filipino cultural values, which would hinder Filipinos in adjusting to the modernization process. As examples of these limitations, she mentions the in-group system, the overly protective and dependent child rearing practices, authoritarian parenting style, and the double standard of morality for boys or girls. Hence, she proposes that modernization will necessitate the giving up of some of the traditional values.

Later, Church (1986) in his review of literature on Filipino personality published since the 1960s points out that many contrasts or conflicts have been noted in literature on personality related values and behavior of Filipinos. These contrasts or

conflicts refer to the dimension of traditionalism on one hand, versus modernism and cultural changes on the other.

The more traditional Filipino values include family solidarity, the security of the group, neighborly ties, respect for authority, hospitality, moral and spiritual values, and religious roots. Conversely, modernization is generally connected with greater individual freedom and initiative, greater independence and personal responsibility, more independent judgment, economic and educational advancement, professional and technical competence and efficiency. The review refers to Quisumbing 1963, Guthrie 1970, Inkeles and Smith 1974, Lapuz 1973, 1978, and Segall 1979.

Further, Church (1986:88) reviews Bulatao (1965a). The latter suggests that the distinction between traditional and modern values may be related to a conflict between values taught in the family and those in the school. While the home teaches "hiya" (embarrassment or shame), moderation, and personalism, the school teaches democracy freedom, rule of laws, involvement in national issues, initiative, self-determination, and self-assertion. This view of the dichotomy between values taught at home and those expected in the classrooms concurs with what has been reviewed earlier on Guthrie (1961).

Furthermore, Church (1986:89) refers to Guthrie (1970) who found that social class was a greater determinant of the traditional versus modernization attitudes than geographic proximity to urban Manila.

More recently, Go (1993) reviews the empirical literature on Filipino families from 1959 - 1989. The author examines the trends concerning popular generalization and stereotypes about the family and marriage in the Philippines. Her topics include consideration of patriarchal or matriarchal system, the view of the increase of family stability versus instability, issues of divorce, marital infidelity, teenage pregnancy, working children, family members living overseas, and the elderly.

The author concludes her research review by affirming that the process of modernization has resulted in nuclearization of the family and the reduction of household size. However, the Filipino family remains functionally extended. Patterns of reciprocal assistance, which have been documented in literature, still appear in various forms. It includes both emotional and financial assistance in times of crisis (Go 1993:62). Overall, this study reveals that the following features of Filipino cultural values persist into the 1990s: interdependence and reciprocal indebtedness, familism, hierarchy of generational respect, and husband-wife egalitarian role combined with division of domain in decision making.

Medina (1995) discusses the lack of integration between values, norms and behaviors, which is apparent in many marriages and family in the modern Philippines.

The author maintains that a comprehensive process of modernization and change is occurring in the Philippine society, such as in the area of technological development, industrialization, mass media, communication, transport, migration toward urban places, and the increased participation of women in the labor force, both locally and abroad. These rapid changes have affected the larger society and also the family.

Referring to Mendez et al. (1984), Medina indicates that the priority to allow sons to pursue higher education over daughters, who would eventually marry and be confined to household activities and childcare, is no longer true. The author asserts that today, parents rely on their daughters more than on their sons. The reason being that daughters are perceived as more conscientious in their study, they can keep stable jobs, and provide for their aged parents (Medina 1995:28). This view differs from Panopio and Rolda (2001:81) who maintain that the sons are prioritized over daughters in educational opportunity.

Also, Medina (1995:28) wrote that Filipina wives are no longer confined to domestic duties and childcare. They can extend themselves to all sorts of careers, activities and business. They play an important role as an economic partner of their husband. Moreover, the idea of greater participation of husbands in household chores and

childcare is gradually getting accepted (Garcia 1984; Escudro 1989). However, most husbands still do not agree to a role reversal. The concept of "house-husband" is largely unacceptable and contrary to the traditional image of the husband as the breadwinner (Medina 1995:29).

Ultimately, Medina (1995) confirms that changes in society have caused family tensions. Traditional norms are being questioned and increasingly regarded as "obsolete". The transition brings about conflict of traditional norms with new modes of conduct. There are inconsistencies in behavior and values, and disagreements on many family issues.

Jocano (1995) reviews the situation of the Filipino family in the 1990s. He proposes two perspectives on the family. One may be viewed from rural perspective and the other from urban. Most rural families are farmers and the urban ones are a mixture of professionals and business elite. However, he notes that many peasants have migrated to the urban centers. The author believes that the value of prioritizing the family over individual interest has a far-reaching significance for the understanding of the Filipino behavior. The family provides support and protection for its members. Added to that, children are considered as gifts of God. Thus, they are much desired and enjoyed. They are regarded as an investment and support for their aged parents.

Jocano (1995:7) also observes that most of the foundational core values of the Filipino culture are either taken for granted or no longer maintained, particularly in the urban centers. While several cultural ideals are still being taught to the young, most of these ideals are losing their influence over behavior. Therefore, he challenges the Philippines to put all efforts toward moral recovery. In his later publication (Jocano 1997), he discusses three foundational core values in the Filipino culture: "kapwa" (interpersonal element), "damdamin" (emotional element), and "dangal" (moral element) (see 2.4.1.2).

Medina and De Guzman et al. (1996) is a study on the structural characteristics of Filipino families and households. It also compares the structural patterns and living arrangements between the rural and the urban and the rich and the poor households. It evaluates the status of the extended family, particularly the strength of the kinship bond, the problems of husband-wife separation, live-in arrangement, and widowhood. The findings show that the households' size and composition vary according to locality (urban or country).

They maintain that the more urbanized the area, the bigger is the extended family household. This is true whether the urban household is rich or poor. It is noteworthy that the richer households in the city are larger and more extended than the poorer ones in the cities. This enlargement of households in the city is due to urban migration. Extended family members rely on their kinsmen, especially the more affluent ones, for housing accommodations and support. This phenomenon reflects the strength of kin ties and solidarity, which is a Filipino traditional value. The study also reveals the closeness of family ties by the preference of residence during old age. The majority of older respondents would live with their children for the following reasons: security, happiness, for the love that children provide, the obligation of children to care for them, the desire to live and die with children and grandchildren, and to provide parental guidance.

Moreover, the husbands are still officially recognized as the authority in the household. The wife substitutes the authority in his absence. Overall, Medina et al. (1996:62) concludes that there has not been much change in the structure of the Filipino family and household, despite the apprehension about Filipino family breakdown, especially among the Metro Manila poor. The findings point to a generally cohesive and stable nature of the Filipino families. They are mutually supportive and a closely knit extended kin group. Thus, the result of this study appears to be more optimistic than Medina (1995), where the author reports tensions and conflicts in families due the changes in traditional values.

Jocano (1998) examines traditional Filipino kinship and family organization based on ethnographic materials. He admits that there are rapid changes in the Philippine community life such as, in attire, houses, food, technology of production, communication, and entertainment. However, he believes that the changes have not significantly affected the basic institution of kinship and the family, and even less the Filipino core values and norms, for instance, "hiya", "utang na loob", "pakikisama", and kinship and family system. In other words, in spite of modernization, the traditional institutions, values, and sentiments are alive and well even in the city. Jocano (1998:3) states:

*Thus, if one removes the outer trappings of modernity, even in the urban areas, one discovers that underneath the veneer, the Filipinos are still traditional in their institutional values and community outlook, even if they are in gray flannel suits.*

His view here seems to contradict what he stated earlier (Jocano 1995:7). Previously, he writes: *"traditional values are either taken for granted or no longer observed, particularly in the urban centers. While several cultural ideals are continued being taught to the young, most of these ideals are losing their influence over behavior"*.

With regard to mate selection, Jocano (1998) lists the Filipino ideals for marriage partners. Girls would dream for a husband who is: (1) a good provider, (2) Good-natured, (3) not cruel, (4) a hard and dedicated worker, and (5) not a drunkard. On the other hand, the male would prefer a wife who is: (1) a good housekeeper, (2) not quarrelsome, (3) frugal and an efficient manager, (4) not lazy, and (5) sexually faithful (Jocano 1998:133).

Jocano (1998:160) concludes by affirming that groups over all Philippines share the structures and dominant features of values, and that changes in family values in the city are superficial.

One would wonder how the Filipino mate selection ideals (Jocano 1998) might influence the motivation toward intercultural marriage. Jones (2001) argues that the development of individual choice for spouse, modernization, and within-group mismatch of gender attitudes lead individuals to seek partners across racial lines. Gordon (1966) attributes intermarriage to modernization, urbanization, and propinquity. Although Jones' view (2001) of gender attitude mismatch may have played a part in the motivation for intermarriage of the couples in our study, this item was not a specific focus of the investigation. The study found that how the partners first met confirmed the theory of modernization, urbanization and propinquity.

In sum, it seems that changes of modernization and urbanization have not substantially affected the core traditional Filipino values, in spite of a superficial accommodation to the modern way of life.

#### **2.4.4 Filipino values among Filipinos in North America**

Given that part of the sample of the study resides in North America, it is appropriate to ask the question whether the Filipinas who live in America have given up their culture.

Santa Rita (1996) attempts to provide cultural understanding for doing psychotherapy with Filipino Americans. He discusses the experience of the Philippines under Spanish and American colonization and how these historical episodes relate to the Filipino self-concept in general. More specifically, Santa Rita posits that the Filipinos residing in the U. S. experience conflicts between their traditional and westernized beliefs, values, behavior styles, and differences in communication styles. Referring to Atkinson (1970), he states that the clashes of values and behavior styles threaten many interracial marriages (Santa Rita 1996:325).

The author highlights some traditional Filipino values and psychodynamics, which he perceives as "cultural baggage". They conflict with the egalitarian ideals and individualism of the American society. The points of contentions are:

1. The primacy of family and small group affiliates over the individual. This value inhibits Filipinos from free expression of dissent. Thus, it tends to detract them from creativity and autonomy that is highly prized by Americans.
2. The strict adherence to gender-role stereotypes and patriarchal family structure goes against the egalitarian norms in the American family.
3. The primacy of smooth interpersonal relationship (SIR) conflicts with the American ideal of openness and frankness.
4. The attitude of "optimistic fatalism" or "bahala na", is contrary to the American belief in future orientation, careful planning, and the drive for excellence and economic development through determined effort.
5. The sensitivity to slights and criticism, because of "amor propio" (self-importance) can lead to withdrawal or vengeance. It is contrary to American directness and sportsmanship.
6. "Hiya" (shame) can hinder competitiveness.
7. "Pakikisama" (conceding to the wishes of the group) does not allow for intellectual stimulation if it involves dissent.
8. "Delicadeza" (proper or nonconfrontational communication), most evident among women, is incongruent with American directness and competitiveness.
9. "Utang na loob" (reciprocity) expects the return of favors received. This too is contrary to American individualism and "bottom line" attitude.
10. The strict adherence to Catholic beliefs on abortion, contraception and homosexuality contributes to a self-righteous, judgmental stance that is out of place in a pluralistic society with alternative life styles. (Santa Rita 1996:325 -326).

Overall, Santa Rita (1996) confirms the persistence of several dominant Filipino traditional values among Filipino Americans.

With regard to the second point, it is noteworthy to add, that Filipino literature on gender role indicates that the Filipino women's submissive behavior is a surface behavior used for public display (Hart 1980; Yap 1986; Andres and Andres 1987; Pido 1986; Agbayani-Siewart 2002). Also, Nadal (2004) submits that the Filipino family is based on an egalitarian model at its root. The Malay root of the Filipino culture is matriarchal rather than patriarchal. However, the Spanish influence has affected Filipino male and female sex roles, in which the male is socialized to be aggressive. In this context, the female is to be the nurturer and care taker of children (Guthrie and Jacobs 1966). Nonetheless, there are domains of decision-making that are shared and others that are particularly the woman's jurisdiction (Porio, Lynch and Hollnsteiner 1978). Thus, with regard to Filipino gender-role, Yap (1986) succinctly states that it is paradoxical.

As to Santa Rita's last point, it can be added that, this point refers to Roman Catholic Filipinos. To date, no study has been found on Evangelical American Filipinos. The points of conflicts presented elucidate the difficulties Filipino Americans may encounter in assimilating to American mainstream culture. However, the last point seems to reflect a degree of partiality. The author seems to be suggesting that Filipino Roman Catholic beliefs on the above mentioned issues are cultural baggage contributive to a self-righteous and judgmental stance that is out of place in a pluralistic society. One would wonder, how a pluralistic society could exclude people who seriously hold these Roman Catholic beliefs if it is to be truly pluralistic.

Similarly, Nadal (2004) examines the identity development of Filipino Americans in order to promote proper therapeutic treatment for this ethnic population in America. He outlines three major distinctives of the Philippine culture: 1. Roman Catholic as influenced by the Spanish rule of the Philippines. 2. U. S. colonization results in Americanization. Thus, Filipinos learn American values and the English language.

As to the third point, Nadal mentions gender neutrality. Distinct from the other writers, he attributes this aspect to the American influence. Others associate the ambiguity of Filipino gender role with the Malay matriarchal roots of the Philippine culture combined with the Spanish "machismo" influence.

Nadal (2004:50) stresses the Filipino sense of being a collective member of the group, shared identity with the group, promoting the honor of the group and social acceptance by the group.

Blankston (1999) aims at highlighting the distinctive values and family customs among the Filipino populations in the United States and Canada. He capitalizes on four widely recognized key cultural values that guide Filipino family relationships and customs: "Utang na loob" (moral debt), "hiya" (shame), "amor propio" (self-esteem) and "pakikisama" (getting along with others). He maintains that these values are still part of the North American Filipino heritage and identity, which stand out as contrast to dominant North American values, especially individualism, independence, and directness.

Agbayani-Siewart and Revilla (1995) discuss topics such as cultural and political history of the Philippines, immigration history and patterns, socioeconomic adjustment, intermarriage, mail-order brides, Filipino cultural values and family structure, and marital and family adjustment. These authors confirm that unlike other Asian groups in America, family authority among the Filipinos is not patriarchal but more egalitarian. Husband and wife share most equally in financial and family decision. Agbayani-Siewart and Revilla (1995:169) refer to Tayuz and Guerra (1969), Yu and Liu (1980) and Andres and Andres (1987). They also point out the high labor force participation rate of Philippine women in America.

Agbayani-Siewart and Revilla (1995) take note of Pido (1986), who states that Filipinos give recognition, deference and opportunities to any family member, regardless of sex, who shows potential for increasing the family's status and position.

In this regard, the situation among the Filipinos in North American they wrote about, may be different than in the Philippines. Panopio and Rolda (2000:81), and Mendez et al. (1984) maintain that families would choose to spend their resources to put sons through higher education over paying for daughters' educational needs. However, Medina (1995) observes that the discrimination against girls is no longer true. The Philippine situation may be passing through a transition that results in conflicting observations.

Later, Agbayani-Siewart (2002) discusses salient Filipino values, which are present among Filipino Americans such as, mutual support, and kinship bond. She asserts that dependence, family loyalty and solidarity and kinship group mark the Filipino life style. To the contrary, individualism is not a Filipino value.

The author reviews the practices of "SIR" (smooth interpersonal relationship), "utang na loob" (reciprocity), "hiya" (shame), "amor propio" (self-esteem), "pakikisama" (conceding to the desire of the group), respect of a person older in age, and extended kinship relationship. Also, she reaffirms that the Filipino gender role is egalitarian because of the matriarchal Malay cultural root of the Philippine people. Agbayani-Siewart (2002) confirms that Filipino traditional values are currently still relevant even among Filipinos living in America.

In short, Santa Rita (1996), Blankston (1999), Agbayani-Siewart (2002), and Nadal (2004) confirm the persistence of relevant Filipino traditional values among the Filipino population in North America.

#### **2.4.5 Conclusion**

There have been certain changes in the practice of the traditional Filipino values due to modernization. However, for the most part the core values persist, such as the importance of smooth interpersonal relationship ("SIR"), group loyalty ("pakikisama"), protecting ones' sense of dignity ("hiya" and "amor propio"), respect

for older persons, kinship and extended family ties, mutual support and reciprocity (“utang na loob”). These Filipino traditional values have not only withstood the changes of time in the Philippines, they are also still important as elements of the Filipino identity in those who reside in North America. Therefore, in intercultural marriages, clashes or adjustment between traditional Filipino values and North American values are to be taken into account.

## **2.5 Mainstream North American values**

Literature on American culture proposes that in America, the majority or predominant culture mostly refers to White middle-class and upper class citizens of European ancestry (Steward and Bennet 1991; Preli and Bernard 1993; Althen 2003). Also, the term "mainstream" is used interchangeably with "majority culture". Consequently, the description of values here primarily pertains to that of the "mainstream" or "majority" white middle-class and upper middle class North Americans, and the discussion will mainly focus on: dominant values, social class differences in values, and changes in traditional values and gender roles.

### **2.5.1 Dominant values**

We will discuss (1) the basic core values, (2) the value of children, (3) the value of time, personal boundary, and being a team player, and (4) goal orientation, practical outlook and directness.

#### **2.5.1.1 The basic core values**

Literature on mainstream North American values, consistently present individualism, independence, equality, autonomy and self-reliance as the most prominent features in North American culture. However, these cultural characteristics appear to be interrelated.

Steward and Bennett (1991) discuss the dominant values commonly associated with American middle-class patterns of thinking, style of communication, perception of self and of the world. They maintain that "equality" is the theme that runs through American social relationships. In other words, "We're all human after all". Thus, interpersonal relations are typically horizontal. Americans appreciate a person who does not "use his authority as a crutch" and who is "a regular guy" (Steward and Bennett 1991:91). Consequently, often there is an inability to recognize persons of different status.

Unlike in the Filipino culture, the "individual self" is more prominent than the group. Simply put, it is the Filipino "I am who my group is" versus the American "I am who I am". In fact, a Filipino saying expresses the concept of collectivism in the Philippine culture: "Tell me who your friends are, and I tell you who you are". The concept of "individualism" seems to be connected with the concept of "equality", because everybody has equal rights as an individual.

Steward and Bennett also emphasize that Americans are often driven by the prominence of their individualism. This value often clashes with foreigners, who base their identities on social meaning. In fact, individualism is stressed in the upbringing of American children beginning at a very young age. Autonomy is promoted even in infancy. Parents encourage their baby to express preferences of food, and to feed itself as early as possible. To the contrary, in most societies the child would be given what the mother considers best, or what she thinks social norms dictate (Steward and Bennett 1991:133). The latter style applies to the Filipino method of raising children (cf., Guthrie 1961; Andres and Andres 1987; Panopio and Rolda 2001).

Further, Steward and Bennett (1991:134) state that Americans do not usually expect submitting to the wishes of authority without question, be it authority vested in family, traditions or organization. Self-reliance is the goal of upbringing from the time a child is born. Unequivocally, individualism occupies a paramount role in the

American value system. Hand in hand with individualism come freedom of choice, autonomy and self-reliance.

However, the authors concede that there seems to be a paradox, in which the undifferentiated self often lacks the resources to protect the individual from pressures to conform. This is exactly because the individual is a free agent. At the same time, the pressures on the individual are informal but pervasive. For example, many people succumb to "fads" and trends promoted by the media or market (Steward and Bennett 1991:135-136).

Thus, Steward and Bennett conclude that American individualism reflects a continuous frontier between the individual and the culture. Nevertheless, self-reliance is an American ideal. The authors draw the attention to the fact that Americans fondly speak of "pulling themselves up by their bootstraps" to become "self-made men" (or women).

They suggest that many of these ideas are based on myths of the Old West. However, they add that for many Americans, the search for autonomy, self-actualization, and personal growth has supplanted the mythic desire to save frontier towns single-handedly from outlaw bands (Steward and Bennett 1991:137). Thus, they assert that independence is the persistent important value of America.

Althen (2003) seeks to enlighten foreigners about "the American way" of thinking and feeling. He focuses on the predominant ideas, values, and behavior of "mainstream" American White middle-class. The author maintains that the White middle-class group has forged the ideals of the American society. They have been the political and business leaders, the university presidents, scientists, journalists and novelists. In his view, individualism is the most important American value. More specifically, each person is responsible for his or her own situation in life. Americans are socialized from early childhood to see themselves as separate individuals and not as part of a close-knit interdependent family, religious group, tribe, nation, or any other collectivity (Althen 2003:5).

As young adults, if economically feasible, Americans are expected to live apart from their parents. Failure to fulfill this expectation may result in being viewed as immature. They can be regarded as being "tied to their mother's apron" or unable to lead a normal independent life.

Consequently, Americans tend to view foreigners as weak, indecisive or overly dependent, if they seem to be excessively concerned with their parents' opinion, following their traditions or fulfilling obligations to relatives (Althen 2003:7-8). For Americans, the ideal person is to be an individualistic, self-reliant, independent person. The individual that Americans idealize prefers an atmosphere of freedom. In contrast, other cultures may perceive the American ideal of "individual freedom" as self-centered.

Thus, many Americans do not display the degree of respect for parents the people in more traditional or family-oriented societies commonly do (Althen 2003:11). As previously mentioned in literature on Filipino values, authority and respect is due according to age and ranking of roles, which a person occupies in the family. Besides, children have a debt of gratitude to parents and older siblings (cf. Hollnsteiner 1964; Hart 1980).

Closely related to the value of individualism and independence, the American society places a high value on privacy. They tend to regard people who always want to be with another person as weak and dependent. This value is fostered in children. Preferably, each child in the family has its own bedroom and keeps it's belonging there (Althen 2003: 13-14). In contrast, the Filipino in general neither desire, nor have the luxury for this kind of privacy. Togetherness is highly desired in the Filipino culture.

#### 2.5.1.2 The value of children

Althen (2003) maintains that Americans have a mixed or ambivalent opinion about the value of children. They consider children as important and valuable. However, they know that having children is a great responsibility. It entails work, inconvenience and expense.

Notably, the media frequently provide reports on studies estimating the cost of raising children. The conclusion of such a study indicates a specific dollar amount parents should expect to spend, if they have a child. Thus, there is a stark contrast between Americans and Filipinos in the way children are viewed. Filipinos value children as blessings from God, as investment and security for old age, as links to strengthen bilateral and extended family ties (Guthrie 1961; Andres and Andres 1987; Matthews 1994).

Congruent with Stewart and Bennett (1991), Althen (2003) opines that generally the objective of American childrearing is to prepare the children to be independent, self-reliant individuals. The hope is that they will be able to manage their own lives by the age of eighteen. Children's training for independence starts very early in their life. Infants and young children are asked to express choices and opinions as soon as they can. Parents often praise and encourage their children by saying: "You can do it all by yourself." Also, parents talk to their children as though the children were small adults. Parents ask the children for their opinions and take these opinions into account when making decisions that affects the entire family.

In contrast, Guthrie (1961) reports that Filipino parents are authoritarian and control their children until later age. Children's will must sometimes be broken, because they must respect their parents and respond to them as expected.

Althen (2003) further observes that American families are child-centered. Families are often very busy, because each child has his/her own schedules of lessons, practices, and social engagements.

However, the author adds that academic achievement receives less emphasis from an average American family than it does from families in many other countries.

American parents tend to complain if their children are given too much homework, because it must not infringe on the children's extra-curricular activities, friendships and part-time jobs. These activities are considered as important as schoolwork in producing the ideal "well-rounded child".

#### 2.5.1.3 The value of time, personal boundary, and the team player

Hall and Hall (1987) base their writing on 180 interviews in Germany, France and the U. S. A. They attempt to compare the values of these three cultures particularly in relation to work and business practices. Thus, they discuss the value of time, space, mobility, communication style, individualism, freedom, pragmatism, equality and being a team player.

The authors explain that Americans are committed to time schedules. They are time conscious and they expect immediate results. With regard to space, Americans value individuality, privacy and keeping a distance (Hall and Hall 1987:142). Also, American mobility encourages the development of new friendships easily, but it is not conducive to close friendships. This aspect seems to be contrary to Filipino in-group and kin and extended family loyalty.

The difference to Filipino "pakikisama" (conceding to the group's wishes) is further evident in that American's group adherence is toward the achievement of common goals of the members. They are not rooted in family and extended family ties. Paradoxically, the American value of being team player may appear contrary to individualism. Hall and Hall (1987:150) add that conformity on the job is more appreciated than individualism. Americans prefer people who do not make waves and who are team players. This phenomenon may indicate the importance of goal orientation.

#### 2.5.1.4 Goal orientation, practical outlook, and directness

Americans pride themselves as being practical and goal oriented (Hall and Hall 1987:148). The authors add that the Americans are interested in the headlines and bottom line, rather than in what comes between. They tend to see things "black and white", or "for or against".

Moreover, American communication style shows the value of directness. They are often uncomfortable with indirectness and can miss nonverbal cues, subtle shifts of voice and so forth (Hall and Hall 1987:146). On the other hand, Filipinos tend to be guarded in their style of communication due to the value of "delicadeza" (proper behavior), "hiya" (shame) and "amor propio" (self-esteem) (Bulatao 1964; Jocano 1997).

Hall and Hall (1987:147) reiterate the strong American value of individualism. Americans focus on the individual, while Asians focus on group. The authors maintain that the American strong bent toward individualism is directly tied to the prominence of freedom such as, in human rights, freedom of religion, freedom of expression and so forth. Americans believe in democratic ideals. Therefore, they pursue equality for everybody before the law and equal opportunity. Consistent with the egalitarianism, they tend to be friendly and informal or casual. On the other hand, Filipinos respect authority according to a hierarchical ranking of role, status and age (Hart 1980; Andres and Andres 1987).

#### **2.5.2 Social class and difference in values**

Adams (1980) points out the differences between the middle-class, the working class and the lower class American family with regard to the traditional or neo-traditional family models and the hierarchical or egalitarian marital roles. The author concludes that currently most American families are divided between the two types of family models. The traditional type is still dominant among the working and lower classes. On the other hand, the middle-class family is closer to "choice-blurred-egalitarian"

style, meaning that in this style the boundary between the roles is flexible. At the opposite end of the continuum, the lower or working class family tends to follow more the traditional, segregational and authoritarian model.

Further, Wagner (1995) differentiates three major socio-economic classes: upper, middle and lower classes. He contends that there are differences in parenting style among the three groups and in role sharing and division of labor between husband and wife. Also, the influence of social class on parenting is both pervasive and complex. However, the author concludes that more studies need to be done about the impact of the social class variable on parenting.

Furthermore, Tamis-Le Monda and Wang (2000) confirm that not only do childrearing practices reflect the values of the culture, but also the values parents teach to their children express the differences of their social class. For examples, middle class American parents may more likely stress children's self-direction, whereas working class parents emphasize conformity to external authority. Moreover, American mothers tend to place a great emphasis on the value of happiness, consideration, popularity and curiosity. In general, American middle class parents tend to foment the value of independence, assertiveness and creativity in their children.

Literature on Filipino values reviewed earlier mentions obedience and respect for hierarchy of generation as important Filipino values. Filipino mothers are more authoritarian than American mothers.

Tamis-Le Monda and Wang (2000) also state that studies done on different nations indicate that virtually all parents value honesty and responsibility. Nonetheless, they vary in the way they stress the values associated with individualism and collectivism. Individualism as a social pattern underlines the motives, preferences, needs, rights, and intentions of the individual. Individualistic values capitalize on self-achievement

and self-maximization, which includes such traits as assertiveness, creativity and curiosity.

Collectivism refers to a social pattern, in which the individual is regarded as an essential part of a larger social group. Thus, it stresses the needs of the group. They include for instance, respect for elders, obedience, and loyalty to family. Referring to Triandis (1995), the authors suggest that the dimension of independence - dependence is the distinguishing key between collectivistic or individualistic cultures. Thus, the Filipino culture can be categorized as a collectivistic culture and the American culture is individualistic.

### **2.5.3 Changes in traditional values and gender roles**

In this section the points of consideration are (1) the changing traditional values, (2) the boon and bane of changes, (3) the similarity of American and Canadian scenes, and (4) the diverse view of family values among Evangelicals.

#### **2.5.3.1 The changing traditional values**

Blankston (1999) postulates that individualism has long been a key American value. However, in North American social life, familism has also had an important role. He views familism as a set of beliefs, values, and behaviors that place more emphasis on families than on the individuals. Family is at the center of the social lives of persons or groups belonging to familism. The individual is perceived as owing certain responsibilities and obligations to their immediate families and kin. Even after adult children have left their parents' home, they have obligations to provide for their parents' financial and other support. In turn, parents help their children throughout their lives such as, by taking in their unemployed adult children or by caring for the grand children. Also, Blankston points out that often individuals in a familistic system sacrifice their own personal goals for happiness or fulfillment for the sake of the family.

This description of familism fits well with the Filipino system and the value of "utang na loob" (reciprocity), in which a person owes a debt of gratitude to parents and siblings, and is expected to care for aging parents and to support kin members.

Further, Blankston explains the evolution of the American family. He writes that until the late 19th. Century most Americans lived and worked on family farms. Hence, their family was the center of their economic and social lives. Married children often resided near their parents' home. Moreover, before 1935, there was no government social security system and children supported their aging parents. The frontier experience drew many people to move away from their families and become disconnected from family obligations. However, the rapid decline in familism occurred when the North American economy became speedily industrialized in the late 19th. and 20th. centuries. Moreover, with the existence of Social Security and other retirement programs, the aged do not need to depend on their children for support.

Thus, the American situation is markedly different compared to that of the Philippines, where even in the urban industrial regions, the majority of the population still cannot benefit from a well-functioning system of social security, or health care. In other words, not only is the cultural value of "utang na loob" (debt of gratitude) expected from children toward aging parents and poorer relatives, but this value may also have persisted for practical reasons.

However, as mentioned earlier, Blankston (1999) highlights four widely recognized key cultural values that guide Filipino family relationships and customs in the United States and in Canada. These are for instance, "utang na loob (moral debt), "hiya" (shame), "amor propio" (self-esteem) and "pakikisama" (getting along with others). He submits that these values are part of the North American Filipino heritage and identity. The persistence of the core traditional Filipino values among the Filipinos in North America is further affirmed by Nadal (2004) and Agbayani-Siewart (2002). Santa Rita (1996) also reported the endurance of the Filipino values, albeit in conflict

with the American values. It may very well be that after several generations the Filipinos in North America will assimilate to the North American system.

Our study on Evangelical intercultural couples does not include Filipino ethnic group members who were born in North America, neither North American Caucasians who were born in Europe. The intention of this consideration was to stay as close as possible to the delimitation of Philippine and North American mainstream dominant cultural background.

Further, literature suggests that both the traditional and the liberal values exist in North America. The nuclear family system had always been the most common or prominent family structure in North America before the 19th. century. However, a nuclear family then tended to live close to extended family members and was more interdependent. There have been social and historical developments toward the loosening of family proximity (Blankston 1999).

#### 2.5.3.2 The boone and the bane of changes

D'Antonio (1983) examines the changes, which have occurred in American family life during the three decades since 1950. He (D'Antonio 1983:85) focuses on nine of William's core values (1955) that seem to be of special relevance to his discussion of changes in family values. They are: 1. Individual achievement. 2. The value of work, in which work is a good thing in itself. 3. Efficiency or practicality. 4. Progress or future orientation (Thus, the elderly are no longer seen as sources of wisdom). 5. Science or rationality. 6. Material comfort (Notably, America is a consumer-oriented society). 7. Equality. 8. Freedom (This value tends to devalue extended family structure and obligations). 9. Humanitarian mores.

D'Antonio believes that together these values yield a profile of an aggressive, activist, and instrumentally oriented people. Young people are expected to be on their own and to think for themselves. They are to work hard, to strive to achieve. They are to believe that everybody has as much opportunity as anybody else to "make it". Added

to that, if they are well off, they must remember the less fortunate, if they were worthy of help (D'Antonio 1983:82-85).

Further, the author refers to Degler (1980), who maintains that in many ways the family values in Western society are similar. These are: 1. Patriarchal authority. This view of gender role has enjoyed support from Judeo-Christian religions, although it seems to be declining. 2. The family as a group. D'Antonio adds that traditionally this is true. The family interests took precedence over those of the individual members (D'Antonio 1983:86). 3. Similarity in ascription. Ascription means that people gain membership in the family by birth and not by achievement. In other words it is not earned.

The fourth value is the family as a haven of affection, warmth and love. However, the author points out that there are tensions between these values and the larger societal structures and values. Parents are teaching their children the importance of achievement, independence, freedom, equality, hard work, and the rewards of material comfort. It is not at all clear if they perceive such teaching as contradictory to the previously mentioned basic traditional family values (D'Antonio 1983:86). The author suggests that Americans are striving to resolve the conflict between the traditional family values, which promote love, solidarity and group concern, and the values held in esteem in the larger society. The latter upholds equality, and individualism.

Consequently, D'Antonio associates the changes in society, such as, the rampant role struggles, divorce, abortion and so forth, with the promotion of the values of freedom, individualism, autonomy, equality, achievement, practicality and work, and the pursuit of material comfort. He believes that this is resulting in the ills that erode the traditional family values.

Another angle of the view on changes is seen in Orthner (1990). He subscribes that the fundamental question is not how to stop the changes but how to shape family

changes. Thus, in his opinion, the issue is how to minimize the disruption on potentially vulnerable groups. He also concedes that the current changes in family situation are connected or rooted in the fundamental shifts in norms and values in the American society. He interacts with issues of individualism versus collectivism, commitment versus autonomy, nurturance versus narcissism, and value revolution versus value evolution.

Regarding family norms, the writer defines them as referring to the behavioral expectations associated with the status and roles of family members. Whereas values are attached to beliefs, norms are attached to and directly guide behavior. He maintains that norms guide our actions; they are cues to appropriate or inappropriate behavior (Orthner 1990:101). He submits that many family problems are not connected to value transitions. Instead, they represent norm transitions. In other words, family processes are currently confused by conflicting, incongruent, and absent family norms. He wrote:

*The rules of family behavior have changed so dramatically in some areas that many men, women, and children do not know how to respond to one another's expectations. With so many alternatives cues to guide behavior, confusion is more the rule than the exception in intimate relationships (Orthner 1990:101).*

He also maintains that Americans have not given up familism. As an example he refers to research, which shows that more than fifty-three percent of adults with living parents see them at least once a month. Fifty-one percent agree that aging parents should live with their children. Among the sample of families and households, fifty-five percent believe that they can call on their relatives in the middle of the night, if they have an emergency. Sixty-six percent say they can borrow \$ 200 from a relative in an emergency.

On the issue of commitment versus autonomy, Orthner (1990) concludes that statistics do not indicate that Americans are running away from marriage and

commitment. Instead, they are searching for meaningful commitments and maintaining a healthy fear of negative consequences for the possibility of failure. He acknowledges that the balance between autonomy and commitment in the American society continues to shift. However, the shift is not away from commitment, rather toward different types of commitments. They are looking for those that provide mutual balance gratification for all family members (Orthner 1990:98). Thus, he rejects the perception that Americans have lapsed into a narcissistic binge.

Orthner disagrees with the idea of the existence of a value revolution in America. He sees the changes as value evolution. He believes that neither a clear-cut positive nor a negative interpretation can be drawn from current trends. It can be positive if one believes that new family patterns are necessary for the new societal conditions. On the other hand, some aspects of current changes have a negative impact on some groups in the American society. He believes that much of the maladaptation that is observed is concentrated in selected pockets of society.

Nonetheless, the tone of this literature in itself seems to reflect much of the underlying individualism, freedom of choice and equality. The negative or positive evaluation of the changes depends on how one chooses to evaluate them. The balance of autonomy and commitment is a shift toward choosing different types of commitment and toward opting for what provides a balance of mutual gratification.

Hiller (1984) perceives the changes in values as resulting from the struggles between the traditional values and sociopolitical and economical evolution in America. The author posits that the worldview of the American society has been an exemplary product of the "classical liberal ideology". She maintains that this ideology originated with Locke and Rousseau in the 17th. and 18th. Centuries. Hiller asserts that American dominant ideology is individualism, which includes a strong commitment to individual autonomy and independence, freedom of choice, equality of opportunity, and equality before the law. Moreover, she submits that feminism is

basically an extension of individualism. It calls for the same tenets of classical liberalism to be applied to women and men alike (Hiller 1984:110).

Hiller discusses traditional and "symmetrical" families. She explains that traditional families emphasize the role of the husband as the provider and the value of women's work as homemaker. In this regard, the different vocations of men and women are accentuated. On the other hand, the "symmetrical" families allow equal access to public roles for women and encourage the development of expressive aspects of husband and father roles. She suggests that the symmetrical family pattern will not destroy family values and that it exists in a small number of families. They are mostly found among the middle-class American families.

Likewise, Althen (2003:175-178) believes that the underlying themes of individualism and equality in American society in general are the foundational themes in the feminist movement. The notion of equality between sexes gained strength as a result of the women's liberation movement of the nineteen-sixties and the nineteen-seventies. It continued to grow as feminism gained a stronger hold in society. Since the nineteen sixties supporters of the feminists movement have sought to change the role of women in America. Currently, most American women no longer see marriage and family life as their main goals. They have broader ideas about the prospect for their lives.

Consequently, there are couples that decide that the wife will be the "breadwinner" and the husband will take care of the house and the children. Therefore, there are such terms as "house-husband" or "stay-at-home dad". Althen (2003) views the current American status of gender role as a fact of historical development and as an offshoot of the values of individualism, equality and independence.

#### 2.5.3.3 The similarity of the American and Canadian scenes

Larson et al. (1994) write on different family patterns and development of family structures in Canada, including ethnic family patterns. Canadian and American societies are like other Western civilization that found their origin in the Judaic, Early Christian and Greco/Roman civilizations. Israel was the source of Canadian or Western basic concepts of morality and religious concepts of the family. Rome was the source of philosophy, science, and the civil concept that has helped shape family ideals and to a lesser extends family practices in Canada today. On this point, Larson et al. corresponds with D'Antonio (1983:99). The latter also acknowledges that in the West the family values originated in some measure from Greek, Roman and Hebrew cultures.

In addition, Schlesinger's paper (1998) reports the strength in Canadian families for the Vanier Institute of the Family in Ontario, Canada. He affirms that the current situation in the Canadian dominant cultural scene is no different from that of the United States. He discusses the trends toward liberal and diverse family structures.

Note that the core values among the Filipino ethnic community in North America are stable, although there are challenges. Blankston (1999) emphasizes four key cultural values that guide Filipino family relationships and customs: “utang na loob” (moral debt), “hiya” (shame), “amor propio” (self-esteem) and “pakikisama” (getting along with others). He submits that these values are part of the North American Filipino heritage and identity both in the United States and in Canada.

#### 2.5.3.4 The diverse view of family values among the Evangelicals

Referring to Popenoe (1996), Blankston (1999) states that many Americans in the nineteen-nineties are beginning to recognize the importance of strengthening family life. Thus, there is a new trend coined "new familism". Popenoe believes that it began with conservative movements such as, the Christian family values organization *Focus on the Family*. Blankston concludes that currently there is an ongoing debate

between those who favor the liberal point of view on families and those who desire to recapture the qualities of traditional families.

More specifically, Hardgrove (1983) discusses the history and evolution of mainstream Protestant and Evangelical values of White Americans, especially on the topic of marriage, family, gender role, abortion and homosexuality. She proposes that the heritage of the Reformation has introduced into Protestantism the concepts of freedom of conscience and adult commitment in ways that could cause tensions in family loyalty, especially in relation to the extended family.

Hardgrove (1983:115) states that the American culture has been fertile in nurturing the previously mentioned concepts. In this regard, she refers particularly to the experience of the settlement of the continent and to Evangelicalism. As to the latter, the author explains that the individual makes a voluntary commitment to Christ and to a Christian way of life, even against the religious tradition of the family. In other words, the Evangelical call is to the individuals, and their primary commitment is to be toward God rather than to any human community.

Further, she refers to the Gallup poll research of 1980 that defines Evangelicals as those, who claim to be "born again". Their activities are aimed at sharing their faith with other people and they hold a literal belief in the Bible (Hardgrove 1983:183). However, she adds that the word "evangelical" has come to be used primarily to designate one branch of Protestantism. It is distinguished from "mainstream" Protestantism (Hardgrove 1983:133). She maintains that there are two branches of Protestantism. One branch is organized as the National Association of Evangelicals, and the other as the main-line National Council of Churches.

At any case, Hardgrove (1983) believes that the foundational concept of Evangelicalism is personal freedom of conscience. This is the primary heritage of the radical Reformation. This idea has encouraged the creation of congregations independently of any denominational structure. Moreover, it has encouraged

individual dissent from positions taken by church organizations, in which one holds membership (Hardgrove 1983:134). Therefore, it is less possible to discuss a specific Evangelical stand by considering denominational statements.

This explanation may shed some light to Prinzing and Prinzing's concern (Prinzing and Prinzing 1991:105) regarding "mixed messages" of Evangelicals on issues of racism and intercultural marriage. They state that although the church has given a token and theoretical support to interracial and intercultural marriages, many church families transmit a different message. In other words, issues of family and values may reach a high degree of consensus in the Evangelical circles, but even in these matters the Evangelicals may not be monolithic.

Referring to Quebedeaux (1974), Hardgrove (1983:134) submits that there are five types of Evangelical Protestantism: closed Fundamentalists, open Fundamentalists, mainstream Evangelicals, Charismatics, and radical Evangelicals of the left. Their family values can range from liberal to rigidly conservative. Hardgrove (1983:139) concludes that family values have served as a focus for intrachurch as well as interchurch conflict. Mainline Protestantism has been moving clearly toward liberalization. However, she predicts that political movements in the denominations and churches may reverse this trend.

Likewise, Airhart et al. (1996) underline the fluidity and heterogeneity of the Protestant perspective on family values in North America. This literature is a compilation of contributions of several writers in an attempt to chronicle the history of various North American religious denominations. The objective is to reveal the development and the decline of the focus on family issues in the denominations as they negotiate the impact of modernity on the family. In their deliberation the authors consider various religious traditions and denominations such as, Southern Baptist, Mormon, Mennonite, Roman Catholic, African Methodist, Episcopal, Methodist, Jewish, Presbyterian, The United Church of Canada, Episcopal ecumenical, and interdenominational groups.

Airhart et al. (1996) confirm that denominations cannot uniformly be labeled liberal or conservative in relation to Protestant family values. Moreover, they highlight the pressure brought to bear on the family by the tension between individualism, familism and market forces. The authors mention feminism as one of the forces that has impacted the modern family. It has produced actions and reactions in all denominations. Added to that, they maintain that the more recent emphasis on fatherhood, which appears in many denominations, demonstrates a social and cultural change that is affecting churches and families.

The authors suggest that in the North American culture, the family seems to be the point where negotiation between religion and modernity takes place as people deal with the conflicts between traditionalism versus liberalism, individualism versus familism, and the public versus the private. Also, idealism clashes with realism, and separation versus engagement with the dominant culture. The message is that in issues of North American family values there is a notable need for ongoing negotiation between religion and modernity.

Further, Bartowski (2001) analyzes the complexity of gender beliefs and practices among Evangelical families. He discusses the historical development of the Evangelical debates about gender and family relations such as, the conflict between traditional family values versus biblical feminists, concepts of masculinity and femininity, sexuality, submission or equality of husband and wife's role, the debate on division of labor in the home and who is the "breadwinner" in the family. Overall, Bartowski (2001) concludes that the American Evangelical scene is heterogeneous even within one denomination. This view concurs with Hardgrove (1983) and Airhart (1996).

Further, Bendroth (2002) postulates that in the 20th. Century America, the ideas of distinguished Evangelical figures and authors such as Bill Gothard, Tim and Beverly LaHaye, and especially James Dobson are representative of the Evangelical views on

values. Bendroth also shows that the meaning and focus of white middle-class Protestant Americans on family issues and application of Biblical teaching has been moving and shifting.

Therefore, the fact that family values among North American Evangelicals can be diverse and conflictive may strengthen the reason for husband and wife's shared church participation, especially in the case of Evangelical intercultural marriage.

#### **2.5.4 Conclusion**

Overall, literature on current changes of values in North America presents a picture of diversity. This heterogeneity is the offshoot of the basic values of individualism, independence, equality, autonomy and self-reliance, which are consistent North American mainstream dominant values.

While literature suggests the existence of family ties in America, the bond appears far less pronounced than that in the Filipino sense of kinship loyalty. The Filipino society is collectivistic and familistic. Of paramount importance are smooth interpersonal relationship, group interest over personal interest, the protection of one's sense of personal dignity, respect for older persons and hierarchical status, close kinship and extended family ties, mutual support and reciprocity within a kin group (Andres and Andres 1987; Jocano 1995, 1998; Medina et al. 1996; Santa Rita 1996; Blankston 1999; Agbayani-Siewart 2002).

However, gender-role can be both egalitarian and patriarchal. There are domains of decision making in the family that are for the men, there are others that are for women, and there are areas of joined responsibility. The Filipino culture is matriarchal at its Malay root, though patriarchal on the surface level, due to Spanish colonization of the country. Literature reports that feminism as a movement has only had a limited impact in the Philippines. Also, the changes of Filipino traditional

values due to modernization are superficial, and traditional values are stable and uniform among the Philippine people.

In contrast, mainstream North American dominant values are individualism, independence, equality, autonomy and self-reliance. With these basic core values come other values such as, frankness, bottom line attitude, orientation toward achievement, the value of the priority of time, orientation toward goal and teamwork.

In the American culture there are struggles between the traditional and liberal family values. The American traditional family is patriarchal. However, feminism is congruent with American core values such as, individuality, independence and equality. Likewise, the diversity and shifting of family values seem to be consistent with those core values. The Evangelical scene displays heterogeneity of perspective on gender role and family. There can be traditional and liberal views within a denomination.

Consequently, the study considers the aspect of cultural differences of the intercultural couples of Evangelical Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. Given that there are cultural gaps to be bridged, there needs to be a strong commitment to a common ground that would allow the partners to negotiate adjustment to one another over a longer period of time of marriage life.

One substantial cultural bridge is that in spite of the distinct cultural and racial backgrounds, the couples have a common Evangelical faith. The fieldwork of this study investigates the role of Biblical teaching and joint church participation as factors that provide the common ground for the couples' marital commitment and adjustment.

## **2.6 Literature of research on the influence of religious orientation and church participation on marital commitment and marital adjustment**

Writers on Evangelical marriage have highlighted the concept of covenant in marriage as a fundamental Biblical teaching for marital relationship (Barber 1974; Anderson and Guernsey 1985; Balwick and Balswick 1991). The outstanding elements in such a union involve unconditional love, long-term commitment, and personal dedication. For Anderson and Guernsey (1985:47), there seems to be little distinction between “covenant” and “commitment”. They state: "the deposit of affect we theologically call covenant and sociologically call commitment is the linchpin for a theology of the family."

Also, the participation of believers in a church community as the body of Christ is essential for mutual care and spiritual growth (Berkhof 1979:396; Firet 1986:75; de Jongh van Arkel 1992:97-98; Heitink 1993:277; Tidball 1995:47).

Moreover, in reality the components of satisfaction, commitment, and adjustment are tightly interwoven to make a good marriage. Added to that, the topic of the study is on the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on intercultural Evangelical couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. Therefore, this section of the review is organized in the following order: literature that focuses primarily on (1) religious orientation and marriage relationship, (2) marital satisfaction, (3) marital commitment, (4) marital adjustment, (5) church participation and marriage relationship, and (6) cultural implication.

### **2.6.1 Religious orientation and marriage relationship**

We consider literature on religious orientation, given that the study attempts to investigate the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment.

In 1962, Glock published a paper, which promoted the study of religious commitment. This study was plausible but seemed rudimentary. Studies on Glock's conceptualization were still to follow. Nonetheless, the author presented a vision for the study of religious commitment, which would include dimensions of ideology (set of beliefs), religious practices (worship, prayer, participation in rituals), cognitive dimension (knowledge of basic tenets and Scriptures), and consequential dimension (ethics and works).

The relationship between religiosity and marriage was the topic of the fieldwork of Hunt and King (1978). They tested the quality of marriage of 64 couples, whose average length of marriage was 4, 05 years. The authors used the Locke - Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale. The result of the study confirmed that there was a relationship between religiosity and marital success. However, the details of the relationship were only partially clear. Hunt and King (1978) also concluded that the marriage system could be considered as a real life-long range laboratory, in which partners' religiosity can be tested. Conversely, one's experience of marriage life may influence and modify one's religious commitment behaviors.

David (1979) attempted to draw a more specific relationship between faith and marital stability. He referred to Bowen (1978) in suggesting that there was congruence between Bowen's triangle theory and marital stability for Christian couples. Bowen (1978) proposed that a three-person emotional configuration was the molecule of the basic building block of any emotional system. The triangle was the smallest stable relationship system. A two-person system may be stable only during calm conditions. When anxiety increases, there was a need to involve the most vulnerable or receptive other person to form a triangle. David (1979) drew theological implication by stating that the third person in the Bowen's central triangle could be Christ (Eph 5:25-26). Thus, Christ can be invited as the third member of the inevitable triangle, who restores calmness and stability in the marital dyad.

Ortega, Whitt and William (1988) studied the influence of marriage within or across religious doctrines on marital happiness. They compared Catholics and Protestants, who were married homogamously with those who were married across doctrines. They found that within homogamous marriages, there was no significant difference in marital happiness among Catholics or Protestants. However, marriages across doctrines between Catholics and Protestants were less happy. Thus, the study concluded that the differences in religious doctrine and ritual affect marital success. The authors also submitted that further study in this area would be worthwhile.

A more recent study, Robinson (1994) investigated the influence of religious orientation on marriage. The sample was 15 couples that were married for at least 30 years. The duration of marriage ranged from 35 to 48 years. The spouses were interviewed separately for approximately one hour each.

Religious orientation appeared to enhance communication. The subjects also described ways, in which faith or religious orientation had provided support in their relationship through good times and difficult times. The support they experienced could be categorized as social, emotional, or spiritual. They also stated that faith had provided them with moral guidance, it had facilitated decision-making, and it had minimized conflict within their marriage. Clearly articulated was that religious faith served as means for guidance in dealing with decisions and conflicts.

Further, the marital commitment in these couples was facilitated through the strong value of the marital bond and through spiritual support in times of difficulty. This seems to resonate with David's idea of Christ as the center of Bowen's triangle (David, 1979). However, Robinson's study (1994) did not limit itself to the influence of faith within the dyad. She analyzes the influence of the larger spiritual system on marriage. Church involvement provided friends and shared activities. Some couples in the sample believed that this was one of the most significant sources of friendship.

However, it must be observed that Robinson's sample consists of "happily" married religious couples. Thus, there could be religious bias here. Nonetheless, this study suggested that religious orientation could have a positive impact on marriages through moral guidance, social, emotional and spiritual growth.

On the other hand, Booth et al. (1995) were less convinced than Robinson (1994) concerning the positive impact of religion on marital quality. They studied the reciprocal impact of changes in religiosity on marital quality. They reported little support for the idea that an increase in religious activity improves marital relationships. Still, they conceded that the increase in religiosity slightly decreased the probability for considering divorce.

Booth et al. stated that religiosity did not enhance marital happiness or interaction. Neither did it decrease conflict and problems commonly thought to cause divorce. On the other hand, an increase in marital happiness slightly increased two of the five dimensions of religiosity considered, to the extent that religion influenced their daily life and church service attendance. However, the latter was also affected by increases in marital interaction. Thus, they suggested the importance of intrinsic religious faith and church participation for marital happiness. Also, their conclusion was that religion and marital quality had a reciprocal but weak connection.

### **2.6.2 Marital satisfaction**

Although our study does not focus specifically on marital satisfaction, the review includes literature on this topic, because the subjects of marital commitment, marital adjustment and marital satisfaction are closely intertwined.

Booth and White (1980) researched the frequency of thinking about divorce. They reported that data from 1,364 married persons interviewed showed that the frequency of thinking about divorce was consistently high for the first ten years of marriage, then it tapered off and remained at a fairly stable level for two decades before

dropping again after thirty years. This finding contradicts marital satisfaction literature, which generally shows a maximum level of satisfaction during early years of marriage.

The data also showed that the presence of young children, rather than teenagers, had a corrosive influence on marital stability. In other words, the presence of preschoolers may deter separation and divorce, but it did not keep people from thinking about divorce. Contrary to this finding, Olson (1989) in his study on differences of stresses in the marital and family life stages, found that marital and family satisfaction was higher at early and later stages of the family life cycle, when couples were living without children. Satisfaction was lowest at the stage when the children were adolescents. However, Olson (1989) described increased marital stresses even during the stage of family with school-age children (6 to 11 years old).

With regards to intercultural marriage, Cerroni-Long (1984:40), referring to Wagatsuma (1973:260), adds that most marriages face higher risks of breakdown in their first decade. The stresses that couples experience at the beginning of their married life are probably the worst. Among these, the problems of adjustment to the spouse's reality vis-à-vis ideal images are especially common in intermarriage situations. These refer to the outmarriages that are based on racial or ethnic stereotypical expectation. Also, Markoff (1977), Sung (1990) and Forna (1992) stated that marital stresses increase in relation to raising children, especially for intercultural couples.

Further, Booth and White (1980) stated that among the men in their sample, from those who professed "strong" religious affiliation, only 6 percent reported thinking about divorce, while among the remainder, 10 percent were contemplating divorce. Better still, among the women, only 7 percent of the "strong" affiliates reported thinking about divorce, while 18 percent of the rest did so. Lastly, the authors emphasized that the fact of divorce was a process. Thinking about divorce was just one stage in the process.

However, there has been literature, which disputed the positive influence of religiosity on marital relationship. In 1982, Schumm, Bollman and Jurich published their study, which reevaluated and contradicted the "marital conventionalization" argument of Edmonds, Withers and Dibatista (1972). Edmonds et al. (1972) maintained that the empirical relationships observed between measures of religiosity and marital satisfaction were spurious artifacts of common contamination of the measures with social desirability (acquiescence response bias). Previously, Edmonds (1967) called this phenomenon "marital conventionalization", which he measured through the Marital Conventionalization Scale (MCS).

Likewise, Glenn and Weaver (1978) adopted the "marital conventionalization" argument to discount the significance of positive associations they observed between religious variables and a measure of marital happiness.

In this regard, Schumm, Bollman and Jurich's study (1982) evaluated the "marital conventionalization" argument. They found that religiosity was an important predictor of marital satisfaction. They concluded that the limitations of the "marital conventionalization" argument should be considered before discounting empirical relationships between religiosity and marital satisfaction as spurious artifacts of social desirability as measured by the MCS.

Anthony (1993) focused on the relationship between marital satisfaction and religious maturity. The sample consisted of Evangelical couples living in Southern California. The finding reported a statistically significant relationship between marriage satisfaction and religious orientation for those individuals, who were intrinsically oriented in their religiosity, and for those, who were either indiscriminately anti-religion or indiscriminately pro-religion. The variables of age, religious homogamy, income, children or premarital cohabitation were not statistically significant for marital satisfaction.

However, the author suggested that both the intrinsically religious oriented and the anti-religious group experienced the healthiest marriages. He underlined the importance of life based on a consistent belief in the two groups as positive influence for the marriage.

Booth et al. (1995) capitalized on the significance of intrinsic religiosity on marital quality, though they maintained that religion and marital quality have a reciprocal but weak link. On the other hand, Anthony's claim (1993) that both the intrinsically religious and the anti-religious had the healthiest marriages remained unqualified. He did not explain what was meant by the healthiest marriage. While the positive quality of intrinsic religiosity seems understandable, it would be difficult to conceptualize the positive element of intrinsic anti-religiosity. Nonetheless, Anthony's conclusion (1993) suggested that what really mattered in his finding seemed to be one's consistency in being religious or anti-religious in order to experience marriage satisfaction.

### **2.6.3 Marital commitment**

The review presents literature that discusses the concept of marital commitment. Also, pertinent literature on measurement of marital commitment is included, because the fieldwork of this study uses a marital commitment assessment instrument.

#### **2.6.3.1 Discussion on marital commitment**

Johnson (1973) presented a conceptual structure for marital commitment, in which he attempted to specify and clarify the various meanings of the term as sociologists and social psychologists had used them. He illustrated the possible relevance of the concept for Social Psychology by the interpretation of a number of Social Psychological experiments in terms of commitment processes.

Johnson discussed the application of the concept of commitment for the analysis of courtship and he illustrated its use on the level of social systems. For this, the

research focused on cohabitation at a university campus. In his paper, the author presented the concept of personal commitment and constraint commitment, which he referred to as behavioral commitment. Personal commitment was based on the individual's personal desire to continue a relationship, whereas constraint commitment was more based on the fact that the person feels he/she ought to or has to continue the relationship.

Subsequently, Kelley (1983) purposed to show how love and commitment were related to one another in heterosexual relationships. He believed that the phenomena, which these concepts referred to, had much in common. At the same time, these two concepts were distinguishable. In his view, love can be without commitment to maintain a relationship with a partner, or to promote the welfare of the partner to the point of sacrificing one's own interest. Thus, Kelley's concept of "love" is not comparable to Johnson's "personal commitment" (1973).

Further, Kelley discussed different models of love. He also concluded that love was measurable at any given point in time of the relationship, though the level of love could fluctuate considerably over time. In contrast, commitment could not be measured at a single point in time. His concept of commitment was of the person located in a causal system that over time stably supports his/her membership in the relationship. Therefore, commitment can only be assessed over a series of temporarily separated occasions.

It seems to be readily conceivable that commitment is on-going and stable in "going through thick and thin" situation together with the partner. On the other hand, love can be up and down. However, the complexity is that love and commitment could, but do not necessarily, overlap. Love is measurable at any given point in time. Added to that, Kelley presented many different types of love.

Lund (1985) did a longitudinal study on 129 graduating university students. She tested the relationships of this group to find out whether continuity of relationship

could be best predicted by a positive pull model (love and rewards) or by the barrier model (investment and commitment). The result of the study showed that the barrier model proved to be the best discriminator of continuation of the relationship after graduation.

Further, Lund distinguished commitment from love as follows: commitment conveys intention to continue a relationship, whereas love refers to positive feelings about a particular person. Both marital satisfaction and love are based on personal feelings, but commitment is primarily based on personal decision. Thus, her description of “love” and “commitment” is less complicated than Kelley’s (1983).

Furthermore, she submitted that in a culture, where there was less individual control of relationships, there could be less impact of “investment” on commitment. This was because there was less personal choice. Lund was careful to acknowledge that her study was limited to measuring the constructs of investment and commitment in a certain type of relationship.

Sabatelli and Cecil-Pigo (1985) examined the interaction between several indicators of relational interdependence and relational commitment in married people, from a social exchange perspective. The results of their study support the hypothesis that a high level of interdependence, positively covaried with the level of commitment. In addition, perceived equity in the distribution of outcomes within a relationship accounts for the largest percentage of variance in levels of commitment. This was reported for both the husbands and the wives. In addition, the results of the regression analyses for both husbands and wives indicated that the most important factors mediating an individual's commitment to his or her marital relationship was the perception of relational equity. Sabatelli and Cecil-Pigo suggested that one possible explanation for the importance of equity had to do with its role as a facilitator of interdependence in long-term relationships.

Earlier Tibaut and Kelley (1959) had noted that over time individuals might tend to look beyond the day-to-day balance of rewards and costs to the long-term inputs and outcomes of the relationship. This is how the sense of equity or inequity is determined. Thus, Sabatelli and Cecil-Pigo (1985) concluded that the role of equity pointed to the limitation of examining marriage satisfaction as the only variable of concern in discussing marital relationships. Perhaps these two constructs require two different explanations. Marriage satisfaction is tied to personal feelings that fluctuate over time, whereas commitment remains stable because it is based on choice.

Kelley (1983) had mentioned that there can be much in common between "love" and commitment, but at the same time, they are different. "Love" can be without commitment to maintain a relationship or to promote the welfare of the partner. Also, Lund (1985) described love as positive feelings about a particular person, but commitment conveys intention to continue a relationship. Thus, both marital satisfaction and love are based on personal feelings, but commitment is primarily based on personal decision.

Wilson and Musick (1996) perceived the aspect of commitment in marriage in terms of "dependence". They focused their study on the relationship between religiosity and marital dependence. The authors stated that theoretically, dependency varies according to the extent to which the spouses were reciprocally dependent on the relationship, the existence of alternatives for satisfying needs in marriage, and the existence of barriers against dissolution of the relationship. The barriers can be internal and external.

The authors concluded that religious belief and practice have an impact on marital dependency. They stated that the impact of this relationship on marital satisfaction was noteworthy. No matter the level of the spouses' happiness with their marriage, their religion made a difference in how committed they were to their marriage relationship.

However, Wilson and Musick did not clarify the nature of the impact. Nonetheless, they maintained that it was not as simple and predictable as many popular writings on the impact of religion on familism and family practice would suggest.

Further, the study suggested that affiliation to a religious denomination did not provide a consistent support for greater dependency. On the other hand, it confirmed that the higher the level of involvement in social life of the church, the more the marriage was valued.

Furthermore, the variation expressed in denominational differences appeared to be variation in associational involvement, or church attendance. Thus, this study clarified that the significant factor to marital dependence was not denominational affiliation but church involvement. These findings support the intention of our study to assess the relationship of both Biblical orientation and church participation in enhancing marital adjustment and commitment. More literature with the focus on church participation will be presented later in this review.

From the research on the various concepts of marital commitment, Koehne (2000) concluded that there are three recurring dimensions of commitment: Firstly, the attractive component that refers to the individual's commitment to the partner based on dedication, devotion, attachment, and love. These are the components that Stanley and Markman (1992) associate with personal dedication. It is the dimension, in which the spouses want to improve the marriage, sacrifice for it, invest in it, and seek the partner's welfare. This component also approximates the relational commitment dimension of Sabetelli and Cecil-Pigo (1985). The latter explain that in relational commitment there is a high level of commitment to maintain the marriage due to bonding with the spouse. There is little need for monitoring alternatives to the marital relationship (Koehne 2000:7).

Secondly, he mentioned the external constraining dimensions that may prevent a marital breakup, such as disapproval of friends, the cost of divorce, concern for the

children, and so forth. Thirdly, he conceived the dimension of moral obligation, such as, the belief in the sanctity of the marriage covenant as a constraining force. The second approximates Stanley and Markman's commitment dimension of Social Pressure. Stanley and Markman (1992) would refer to the third as Morality of Divorce (Stanley and Markman 1992) (cf. Method, in Fieldwork). Thus, Koehne summarized that couples may preserve their marriage because they want to (personal commitment), because they ought to (moral commitment), or because they have to (structural commitment).

In his fieldwork Koehne (2000) examined the influence of three variables (relational commitment, spousal intimacy, and religiosity) and seven select sociodemographic variables (age, length of marriage, educational attainment, personal income, frequency of church attendance, presence of children, and number of children) on marital satisfaction. His sample consisted of 233 participants (119 men and 114 women), including 94 couples, who filled out the questionnaire. The average age was 46 years old and these individuals had been married for 21 years.

The study's findings (Koehne 2000:83) suggested that spousal intimacy is important to marital satisfaction for both men and women. The spouses that reported high levels of intimacy also indicated being more satisfied with their marriages. However, "relational commitment" was the most important factor for the women as predictor of marital satisfaction, which is not the case for the men. The women who were highly committed to their marriages reported higher level of marital satisfaction.

The other selected variables were not found significant for predicting marital satisfaction. Frequent church attendance and religiosity did not demonstrate direct predictive power on marital satisfaction. However, Koehne added that the failure to find evidence of the influence of religiosity on marital satisfaction could be a methodological issue. Religiosity is a complex, multidimensional phenomenon (Glock 1962). In his study, Koehne defined religiosity as the influence of religious beliefs and teaching on life and marriage.

The study on Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipina wives with North American Caucasian husbands investigates the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on the couples' marital commitment and adjustment. It involves their understanding of unconditional or sacrificial love and the permanency of marriage. Church participation is conceptualized as more than frequency of church attendance, but as being an active part of the church community.

#### 2.6.3.2 Marital commitment measurement

Before opting to use the CI (Commitment Inventory) (Stanley and Markman 1992) for this study, several other commitment measurements were considered.

Sabatelli and Cecil-Pigo (1985) published measurements of commitment consisting of several scales: 1. The Marital Comparison Level Index (MCLI) was designed to assess an individual's evaluation of the outcomes derived from his/her relationship in comparison with what is expected. The less the outcome from the relationship meets the person's expectation, the more the person has complains. 2. The Relational Equity Scale evaluates the degree to which the person feels that, all things considered, the outcomes derived from the relationship are proportionate to their investments. 3. The Barriers to Marital Dissolution Scale indicates the respondents' perceptions of internal and external constraints that prevent marital breakup. 4. The relational Commitment scale assesses the levels of relational commitment.

However, the authors acknowledged the problematic aspect of their research, in that the concepts of equity, satisfaction, and commitment could give rise to speculation that all the scales are simply asking the respondents about marital satisfaction in a slightly different way (Sabetelli and Cecil-Pigo 1985:936).

With regard to the relationship between social sciences and theology, Pramann (1986) researched the connection between religious belief and marital functioning. He

believed that traditional theology and Biblical data suggest a link between one's commitment to God and the commitment to one's spouse (Pramann 1986:88).

In his dissertation he discussed several commitment measurements such as that of Spanier, Johnson, Ward, Leland, Clodfelter, Jayroe, Swenson and Moore, Rusbult, Broderick, Kimmon, Lund, and Stanley. However, he wrote that the studies could generally lack a consistent definition of marital commitment, and at times there was a divergence between the researchers' definition of commitment and what the instrument actually measures.

Stanley and Markman (1992) presented a model for conceptualizing relational commitment with a description of the corresponding measurement. They viewed commitment as two encompassing related constructs of: (1) personal dedication, and (2) constraint commitment.

Personal dedication refers to the desire to maintain or to improve the quality of relationship with the partner for joint benefit. It is evidenced by the desire and the behavior to continue the relationship and to improve it, to sacrifice for it, to invest in it, to connect to the personal goals, and not just to pursue one's own but to consider the partner's welfare.

On the other hand, constraint commitment refers to internal or external forces that constrain partners to maintain relationships regardless of their personal dedication. These pressures favor relationship stability. They hinder termination of a relationship by causing the break up to be economically, socially, personally, or psychologically more costly (Stanley and Markman 1992:596).

Thus, Stanley and Markman (1992) presented a description of personal dedication and constraint commitment that resembles but it is more developed than Johnson's concept of personal commitment and constraint commitment (1973). According to the latter, personal commitment is based on personal desire to continue the

relationship, and constraint commitment is based on the fact that the person feels that he/she ought to or have to continue the relationship.

The CI (Commitment Inventory) (Stanley and Markman 1992) assesses the levels of couples' commitment on dedication and constraint commitment. Their paper reports two studies. In study one, items developed for the CI were given to a sample of 141 subjects. Items analyses resulted in selection of the items for the inventory. In study two, 279 subjects yielded data used in further testing of the CI. Tests were conducted on the reliability of the subscales, in the factor structure of the CI, and the relationships between the CI and various other measures of commitment. The CI was further examined in relation to various demographic variables and various measures of other constructs. Preliminary evaluation of the CI showed substantial reliability and validity. Reliability for total dedication commitment was reported at .95, and for total constraint commitment at .92.

This instrument is comprehensive in assessing a wide array of dedication and constraint items, and at the same time allows flexibility for selecting items of the subscales that are pertinent. Therefore, our study uses part of the CI for assessing marital commitment levels of the participants in the research. More description on its application is presented in chapter III (3.3.3 Questionnaire 3).

Johnson (1995) mentions definitions of various types of commitment and their major components, the relevant studies, which have been done in this area and the measurement instruments of commitment, which have been published. It also indicates variations of commitment associated with relational types, relational stages, gender and sexual orientation. It can be assumed that culture would also be significant as a variant. However, the publication does not include cultural or ethnic variation, which is of special interest to our study. Thus, for cultural specific data, our study relies on the method of personal interview.

## **2.6.4 Marital adjustment**

This section discusses studies that have tried to analyze the influence of religious belief on various aspects of couples' adjustment. Given that our study uses a marital adjustment questionnaire in its fieldwork, pertinent measurement instruments for marital adjustment are included in the review.

### **2.6.4.1 Religious belief and aspects of couples' adjustment**

Quinn (1984) measured religiosity through the Spiritual Well-Being Scale and Existential Well-Being Scale on a sample of 78 highly religious couples. Also, their religiosity as measured by the two instruments was positively correlated with the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI).

Quinn found that partners, who agreed on religious beliefs and activities showed higher marital satisfaction scores than those, who did not. However, religiosity did not rank highest among the variables predicting marital satisfaction. On the other hand, affective communication, time together, and problem-solving communication were the top three variables for marital satisfaction. Thus, the study suggested that even for couples, who were religiously committed and who regularly attended church, religiosity was not associated with marital satisfaction. Likewise, other studies on marital commitment indicated that marital satisfaction and marital commitment could be independent from one another. Nevertheless, the study confirmed that within the religious community, higher religiosity predicts marital adjustment.

Wilson and Filsinger (1986) were concerned with researching multi-dimensional interrelationships between religiosity and marital adjustment. They analyzed data from a sample of 190 married couples. The attempt was to isolate aspects of religiosity that predicted each of four dimensions of marital adjustment. Wilson and Filsinger reported that religious ritual, religious experience, and to a lesser extent, religious belief, correlated significantly with the dimensions of marital adjustment. This was even when marital conventionalism was controlled. They added that the

consequential dimension correlated with marital adjustment for men, but not for women. The authors suspected that the wives, who scored high on the consequential dimensions, might have given conventional responses.

They added that religiosity affected all aspects of marital adjustment except for affectional expression. The authors also conceded that the findings might not apply to all religious groups. Its focus was on the degree of religious commitment within a sample of religiously oriented Protestants, who attended church. Nevertheless, within the religious community, higher religiosity predicts marital adjustment, though further study would be needed to explain the reasons for this relationship.

Roth (1988) studied the relationship between spiritual well-being and marital adjustment. She used the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Paloutzian and Ellison 1982) and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier 1976) on a sample, in which there were representations from ten Protestant denominations. She found that spiritual well-being correlated significantly with marital adjustment, but there were differences in the numbers of years of being married. Further, when measured with Existential Well-Being, the EWB (Existential Well-Being) scores correlated highly with marital adjustment at most marital stages.

Consequently, Roth submitted that the results of the study were supportive of the hypothesis, which indicated that lived-out spirituality was an important factor for the perception of marital happiness.

An aspect of adjustment that Rusbult et al. (1991) called "accommodation" became the focus of their research. They defined "accommodation" as the willingness to inhibit impulses to react destructively, when the partner has engaged in a potentially destructive act. Instead, the person responds constructively to the partner. These authors reported six studies on accommodation in close relationships.

Studies 1 and 2 demonstrated that “accommodation” was lower under conditions of reduced social concern and lower interdependence. Studies 3, 4 and 5 revealed that “accommodation” was associated with greater satisfaction, commitment, investment, centrality of relationship, psychological femininity, partner perspective taking, and poorer quality alternatives. Also, they reported that commitment played a fairly strong role in mediating willingness to accommodate.

Study 6 showed that couples' functioning well was associated with greater joint and mutual tendencies to inhibit destructive reactions. Besides, study 6 demonstrated that self-reports of “accommodation” were related to relevant behavior measures.

Rusbult et al. (1991) summarized: 1. Accommodation was regarded as something of a social cost. 2. It was associated with features of relationships, commitment to relationships, importance of relationships, and self-centeredness. 3. Willingness to accommodate may be primarily (although not entirely) mediated by feelings of commitment to relationships. 4. Couples' functioning was generally associated with strong tendencies to inhibit destructive impulses, especially when such behavior was mutual.

Rusbult et al. did not intend to investigate the inner force, which empowered the will to inhibit impulses to react destructively. The study was not concerned with investigating the influence of Biblical concepts such as, mutual submission and mutual respect of spouses (e. g. Eph 5: 21; 1 Pe 3: 8 - 10), or unconditional "agape" love. Interestingly, willingness to accommodate seemed to agree with Biblical teaching, such as on unconditional love and mutual submission, being quick to hear, slow to anger (James 1:19) and so forth. Thus, the spiritual dimension of accommodation is a factor worth studying. If one's Biblical orientation could positively affect accommodation in marriage relationship, it would be all the more obvious in intercultural marriages.

Yet another aspect of adjustment was the focus of Brock (2001). This study examined the role of faith, as defined by commitment to Christ, in overcoming personality type differences in a Christian marriage. The sample consisted of 25 couples, which had been married for an average of 40 years. They were active in their commitment to faith, and stated that they had a "good marriage".

Brock applied to his sample, MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator), Genogram, Marital Satisfaction Graph, Christian Marriage Questionnaire, and personal interview. He found: 1. A direct relationship between one's faith and one's identity as a result of faith-based decisions and actions. A strong Christian bond marked by love and forgiveness could function as a dedicative factor. 2. The seriousness with which the participants took their marriage vows often functioned as constraintive factor. 3. The strength of the participants' marriages most frequently resulted from a combination of both dedicative and constraintive factors, usually one factor showing prominence over the other. 4. The vast majority in the sample (90%) attributed their relationship with God as a factor in helping them remain together as a couple through difficult times. The trying times included not only personality type differences, but also the death of loved ones, the loss of a job, or moving. 5. However, when couples demonstrated drastic differences in personality type, constraintive factors were not always sufficient to maintain the union.

His last finding seems striking, in that all things considered, drastic differences in personality type are serious hurdles to overcome in same-culture marriages, perhaps more difficult to deal with than cultural differences.

#### 2.6.4.2 Marital adjustment measurement

Spanier (1976) published a frequently used measurement instrument for dyadic adjustment, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS). A dyad refers to a married couple or other similar relationships. He subscribed to the notion that adjustment is an ever-changing process with a qualitative dimension that can be evaluated at any given point in time on a dimension from well-adjusted to maladjusted.

Thus, dyadic adjustment can be defined as a process, of which the outcome is determined by the degrees of: (1) troublesome dyadic differences; (2) interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety; (3) dyadic satisfaction; (4) dyadic cohesion; and (5) consensus on matters of importance to dyadic functioning (Spanier 1976:17). However, after further analysis, only three of the original five hypothesized components were still confirmed. These were dyadic satisfaction, dyadic consensus, and dyadic cohesion (Spanier 1976:21).

The DAS (Dyadic Adjustment Scale) consists of 32 items designed for use with married and unmarried dyads. It presents a factor analytical study on the conceptual definition set forth in the earlier work and suggests four empirically verified components of dyadic adjustment for its subscales. They are dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus and affectional expression. The literature reports evidence of content, criterion, and construct validity. Its reliability is at .96 as measured through Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha.

However, Spanier (1976) conceded that there were a number of methodological issues, which remained for future research. It mentioned that the use of weighted items was not compelling. On the areas surveyed by the 32 items in the scale, the importance variable was skewed in the direction of "very important".

Almost a decade later, Spanier and Thompson (1982) attempted to reevaluate the DAS. They reconsidered the factor structure of the DAS and its subscales using a maximum likelihood, confirmatory factor-analysis procedure. The replication study was done three years after the original with a new sample from the same geographical area. Spanier and Thompson reported high reliability for the overall scale. The four subscales' factors accounted for 94 % of the covariance among items. However, subscale affiliations were not perfectly replicated in the confirmatory solution. Nonetheless, they stated that procedures of confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis rarely resulted in factor structures that were precisely identical to those in

earlier analyses. Given the fairly similar results found in the reevaluation, Spanier and Thompson concluded that the DAS adequately served for evaluating dyadic adjustment.

However, literature showed that there was a controversy surrounding the question of whether the DAS of Spanier (1976) was a one-dimensional global measure or a multidimensional instrument (Busby et al. 1995:292). The original definition of dyadic adjustment was multidimensional (Spanier and Cole 1975; Spanier 1976).

Busby et al. (1995) considered it appropriate to improve the DAS to clarify that it is not a global instrument, so that the subscales are valid. Thus, Busby et al. (1995) revised the subscales by using hierarchical confirmatory factor analysis to clarify the dimensional structure. They found that the subscales of Spanier's DAS contained some items that were homogeneous and others that were heterogeneous. They tried to correct the problem by selecting items that were homogeneous. Thus, seven first-order scales were created, which were combined to form three second-order concepts of consensus, satisfaction and cohesion.

The RDAS (Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale) also referred to as ADAS (Adapted Dyadic Scale) (Busby et al. 1995) consist of only 14 items. However, the more compact form has a high correlation with the original DAS. The reliability of the total RDAS as measured through Cronbach's Alpha was reported at .90. Also, analyses correlating the RDAS with another popular measurement instrument, the MAT (Marital Adjustment Test) (Locke and Wallace 1959), showed evidence of construct validity. After conducting a series of confirmatory factor analyses with distressed and non-distressed couples, the study reported that the RDAS could be used with both distressed and non-distressed people.

Thus, the RDAS is an improvement over the DAS, which was a progress over the MAT (Marital Adjustment Test) (Busby et al. 1995:305). Still, Busby et al. (1995)

recognized that this revised instrument did not measure certain areas of dyadic functioning such as, couple's finances and communication.

Our study with the Evangelical intercultural couples uses the RDAS (Busby et al. 1995) in questionnaire 4 to examine the levels of the couples' marital adjustment. The intention is not for clinical use, or to diagnose distress or non-distressed condition. Nonetheless, the RDAS is applied, because it is compact, and it has a more balanced arrangement of subscales than the DAS, and at the same time it correlates with the DAS. These are the qualities that increase its value for use in research studies (Touliatos et al. 2001:81). Moreover, it is the personal interview that clarifies the factors of religiosity and culture left out in the measurement.

### **2.6.5 Church participation and marriage relationship**

As previously mentioned, Quinn (1984), Ortega et al. (1988), Robinson (1994), and Wilson and Musick (1996) suggested the importance of shared church activities for marriage relationships. More specific focus on the positive influence of shared church participation on couple's functioning was evidenced in Larson and Goltz (1989), Wilson et al. (1997), and Call and Heaton (1997).

Larson and Goltz (1989) examined the influences of religious homogamy, religious affiliation and church attendance on personal and structural marital commitment. The data were gathered from a random sample of 179 married couples. This study found that church attendance, duration of marriage and satisfaction with family life were the major predictors of structural commitment. In addition, church attendance was a major predictor of personal commitment.

Further explanation to the significance of church attendance was presented in Wilson, Parnell, and Pagnini (1997). Wilson et al. mentioned that frequency of church attendance for religious fundamentalists increased exposure to like-minded people. Consequently, frequency in church attendance reinforced more traditional family

values on them. Conversely, where more liberal views were espoused, frequent church attendance in such a context increased the likelihood of finding more liberal family attitudes and behaviors. In other words, the study suggested that frequent church attendance strengthened exposure to certain religious orientation. Thus, Wilson et al. (1997) seem to suggest frequent church attendance as an environmental influence on the couples' attitudes.

On the other hand, Call and Heaton (1997) studied the effect of religious experiences on marital stability. This research was based on panel data from the National Survey of Families and Households (N= 4587 married couples). No single dimension of religiosity adequately described the effect of religious experience on marital stability.

However, the frequency of religious attendance had the greatest positive impact on marital stability. When both spouses attended church regularly, the couple had the lowest risk of divorce. To the contrary, when spouses differed in church attendance, the risk of marital dissolution increased. All significant religious affiliation influences disappeared once demographic characteristics were controlled. Moreover, the wife's religious beliefs concerning marital commitment and non-marital sex were more salient to the stability of the marriage than the husbands' beliefs.

It is noteworthy, where one spouse attended church regularly, while the other never attended church, likelihood for divorce was higher than when both spouses did not attend church at all. This finding seemed to bear partial similarity with Anthony (1993). Anthony maintained that there was a statistically significant relationship between marriage satisfaction and religious orientation for those who were intrinsically religious, those who were either indiscriminately pro-religion or indiscriminately anti-religion.

Nonetheless, Call and Heaton (1997) confirmed that, when both spouses attended church regularly, and they shared religious activities, the risk of divorce was the lowest. In this regard, Call and Heaton's finding aligned with Quinn (1984), Larson

and Goltz (1989), Robinson (1994), and Wilson and Musick (1996). These writers reported a positive impact of church participation on marriage relationship. Overall, it is fair to conclude that intrinsic religious orientation, shared church activities, and regular church attendance have a positive impact on marriage.

### **2.6.6 Cultural implication**

Heinonen (1996) expressed the significance of cultural values with regard to the church participation for Filipino family life.

This study on Filipino-Canadian immigrants researched the connection of family resilience to stress, with recreation and leisure. The author investigated a Filipino immigrant community in a medium size Canadian city of about 600, 000 inhabitants. The focus was on the group's ability to develop strategies and coping mechanisms, which were a vital part of resilient families of the immigrant community. The strategies for coping with stresses helped negotiate the relocation process, the development of new job skills, and the method of filling unoccupied time. The goal of the study was to promote health and well-being in the immigrant family life.

Relevant items in the study were the concepts of leisure behavior, protective factors, parenting practices, health behavior and social networks. Remarkably, church activities and belonging to a church family appeared as important factors for the people's well-being. A woman in the study explained how the church played a very important role in maintaining their spiritual, emotional, social and even physical health. Foundational was the emphasis on social connection and expression of common Filipino cultural identity, including beliefs, values and practices.

The Filipino cultural feature concurred with the review presented earlier in Literature on intercultural marriage of Filipinas with foreign men (cf. Beer 1996; Samonte 1992), that Filipinas tend to seek out their compatriots for social support. Religiosity and church attendance have also been reported as facilitating social and spiritual

support, beneficial in dealing with stresses in marriage and living overseas (Heinonen 1996; Beer 1996; Samonte 1992). However, existing literature is limited to Roman Catholic Filipinas. At the same time, studies have also indicated the importance of shared religious faith, church activities, and regular church attendance for intra-married Caucasian North American couples.

Our study investigates the situation in which both the need for shared church participation and the need for social networks can be adequately met, when spouses are of different cultures such as with, Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas married to Caucasian North American men.

Furthermore, Fine (2003) referred to Johnson (1991), who proposed three categories of commitment: moral commitment, personal commitment, and structural commitment. Fine (2003) studied the Hispanic population in the U. S. A. He pointed out that Hispanics tended to be collectivistic. Consequently, they experience moral and structural commitment, rather than personal commitment. On the other hand, research on marital commitment with white, middle-class respondents tended to focus on the personal aspect of commitment. Therefore, the paper suggested the need to consider individuals, whose cultural backgrounds were associated with collectivistic orientation. Such population may adhere more to structural or moral aspects of commitment, rather than with personal satisfaction. This phenomenon is in line with what has been suggested in the study on Filipinas married to Japanese (Bauzon 1999) (see 2.1.2.5 Lit. on intercultural marriage of Filipinas with foreign men).

Fine, further stated that with the Hispanics, traditionalism and familism may have an affect on relationships. His study explored the possibility that individuals from different cultural backgrounds may place weight on different considerations when evaluating their level of commitment to their relationship. It is worthy of notice that, collectivism and familism are also Philippine cultural values. In contrast, individualism and independence are North American values (see 2.4 Lit. on mainstream Philippine and American salient cultural values).

This idea of cultural variation would seem congruent with Johnson (1995), in which he drew the attention to the existence of different kinds of commitment associated with relational type, relational stage, gender and sexual orientation. Johnson (1995) did not include cultural variation in his publication. It may mean that at the time of the publication, there was no known study in relation to cultural variants of commitment.

### **2.6.7 Conclusion**

The literature shows that there are various dimensions of religiosity, commitment and adjustment in marital relationship, and aspects of church participation. It also clarifies that there is no perfect measurement of marital commitment and marital adjustment. However there are possibilities for choosing the most suitable one for the purpose of the study. Moreover, research is still lacking behind in the investigation of intercultural variants.

Stanley and Markman (1992) conceptualize commitment as two encompassing related constructs of personal dedication and constraint commitment. Personal dedication refers to the desire to maintain or to improve the quality of relationship with the partner for joint benefit. It is evidenced by the desire and the behavior to continue the relationship and to improve it, to sacrifice for it, to invest in it, to connect it to personal goals, and not to pursue one's own but to consider the partner's welfare. In contrast, constraint commitment refers to internal or external forces that constrain the partners to maintain relationship regardless of their personal dedication. Thus, this commitment favors relational stability. To assess the levels of these commitments, Stanley and Markman present the CI (Commitment Inventory), which covers the many dimensions of marital commitment. However, subscales that are relevant for the purpose of the study can be selected, rather than applying the whole CI. Preliminary evaluation of the CI showed substantial reliability and validity.

Reliability for total dedication commitment was reported at .95, and for total constraint commitment at .92.

Given that the CI is comprehensive in assessing a wide variety of dedication and constraint items, and at the same time permits selection of subscales' items that are pertinent, our study decides to use part of the CI. Questionnaire 3 of the study, which assesses marital commitment levels of the participants, is based on the CI. More pertinent description of this measurement is presented in section 3.3.3. Questionnaire 3 of the Fieldwork.

Busby et al. (1995) revised the frequently used Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) of Spanier (1976). The RDAS (Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale) or the ADAS (Adapted Dyadic Adjustment Scale) of Busby et al. (1995) is reported as an improvement over the DAS (Spanier 1976), and better than the MAT (Marital Adjustment Test) (Locke-Wallace 1959) (Busby et al. 1995:305). The RDAS is more compact, and presents a more balanced arrangement of subscales than the DAS. Therefore, the RDAS can be better suited for the use in research studies than the DAS. However, the authors admitted that the revised instrument did not measure certain areas of dyadic functioning such as, couple's finances and communication.

Questionnaire 4 of the study on Evangelical intercultural couples uses the RDAS (Busby et al. 1995), to examine the levels of couples' adjustment.

Various studies on the influence of frequency of church attendance, joint church participation, and religious orientation on marital satisfaction and marital stability have been done among same-culture North American couples such as the studies of Quinn (1984), Ortega et al. (1988), Larson and Goltz (1989), Robinson (1994), Wilson and Musick (1996), Wilson et al. (1997), and Call and Heaton (1997). Overall, the studies concluded that intrinsic religious orientation, shared church activities and regular church attendance have a positive impact on marriage.

There is no report of studies on the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital well-being of intercultural couples. The next chapter will present our investigation on marital commitment and marital adjustment of the Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands in relation to the relevance of religious orientation and their intercultural distinctives.

## Chapter III

### FIELDWORK

#### 3.1 Method

##### 3.1.1 Sample

In total, 38 couples that meet the criteria were approached by phone or e-mail. The participants must be Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipina and North American Caucasian husband. They must have been married for at least 7 years. However, only 26 couples were willing to participate, and 2 of them withdrew before the interview. They had marital problems, and felt uncomfortable to join the study. One couple initially withdrew, because they had difficulty with their children, but later on decided to continue. One couple that was willing to take part, had to be excluded because we found that they did not fully meet the criteria.

Thus, those who participated were 23 couples. Each spouse was interviewed separately. However, with one couple only the husband was able to fill out questionnaire 3 and 4. The wife participated in the personal interview but was unable to fill out questionnaire 3 and 4 due to language difficulty. In total 45 persons completed all the questionnaires, and 46 individuals participated in the personal interview.

All participants have been married for at least 7 years. The shortest time of having been married is 7 years and 3 months (1 couple) and the longest is 37 years (1 couple). Most have been married more than 10 years (20 couples), and among them 5 couples have been married over 20 years. It was the first marriage for all the women. For one of the men it was his 3rd marriage after a second divorce, and for another it was his second marriage after being a widower.

### **3.1.2 Means of communication**

The filling out of the questionnaire and the personal interview by phone lasted for an average of 1 hour. The conversations were fluid and enjoyable, although in some cases the phone service was interrupted. Once we were engaged in conversation, the participants generally were not conscious of the passing of time, especially the wives.

Their area of residence is spread out over various places in Canada and the U. S. A. (16 couples), and the Philippines (7 couples). Thus, it was not feasible to pursue the method of face-to-face interview.

On the other hand, the method of interview by phone also has its benefits.

In the Filipino culture, people tend to please the person they respect by giving the expected answers. Face-to-face encounter is often avoided to preserve smooth interpersonal relationship, and to dodge having to respond to embarrassing requests, questions, complaints, or to make uncomfortable decisions, which can cause “hiya” (shame) (Lynch 1962). Bulatao (1964:428) tentatively defines "hiya" as a painful emotion arising from a relationship with an authority figure or with society, inhibiting self-assertion in a situation, which is perceived as dangerous to one's ego. It is a kind of anxiety or fear of experiencing one's ego exposed, unprotected and unaccepted.

The possible skewing of “hiya” may be reduced by the distant contact. Moreover, the participants do not have to tidy up the house or dress up for the event and it can be at any time during the day or evening. Thus, they would be less inconvenienced. Furthermore, by filling out of the questionnaires over the phone, time and mail constraints could be minimized.

Although from the tone of voice one can catch nuances of some situational and emotional information, this means of communication lacks the ocular capacity for detecting other non-verbal and environmental information. Nevertheless, the

shortcoming of this method may have to be overlooked for the sake of the advantages mentioned previously.

In the attempt to acknowledge possible differences due to a cultural impact of the location of their residence, some pertinent data of the couples living in North America were separated from those residing in the Philippines. However, with the small sample of participants that live in the Philippines, it is difficult to establish the local variable clearly in this study.

Nonetheless, literature confirms that despite the clashes with North American values, salient key Filipino cultural values are still part of the heritage and identity of the Filipino population in the United States and Canada (Agbayani-Siewart 2002; Blankston 1999; Santa Rita 1996).

The participants were found by contacting several Filipino pastors and churches, listed in phone directories or websites, and through networks of friends in the U. S., Canada, and the Philippines. In the Philippines particularly, it was by approaching Christian organizations and several upper-middle class churches with predominantly English language services. They were asked if there were such intercultural couples in their congregation that would be willing to participate. Adherence to the Evangelical faith was stressed, but it was not limited to affiliation with a particular denomination of Evangelicals. The participants were from the following denominations: Evangelical Free Church (4 couples), Baptist (5 couples), Non-denomination Evangelical (7 couples), Presbyterian (1 couple), Pentecostal (1 couple), Church of God (1 couple), Southern Baptist (1 couple), Church of Christ (1 couple), United Methodist (1 couple), and United Church (1 couple).

The first contact with the pastors, contact persons, organizations or institutions was done by a short phone call or e-mail, followed by a letter clarifying more who the researcher was, the intention of the study and the recruitment of participants. Leads were further pursued, if these contacts facilitated the name and e-mail address or

phone number of an intercultural couple that had given the permission to be contacted. The prospective candidates were then personally approached by e-mail or phone.

The field study was undertaken from April 2005 to March 2006. The first month was spent on finding possible contacts, especially by searching websites, phone directories, and contacting Filipino pastors in Canada and the U.S. The first interview took place in the first week of May 2005.

## **3.2 Procedure**

### **3.2.1 Preparation for the interview**

On the average, four to five contacts with the participants took place before the actual interview. Many times the interviewer and the participants were in different time zones, so that the time difference was an important item to consider when making arrangements for phone calls. Possibility for withdrawal from participation appeared to occur at any stage of the relationship.

#### **3.2.1.1 Initial contact**

During the initial contact by phone or e-mail, it was briefly explained how their phone or e-mail was secured, and what the intention of the contact was. The objective was for the interviewer to introduce herself and to find out whether the persons were interested in receiving more detailed information about the study. If the answer was positive, they were asked to give their phone number, e-mail or physical address, depending on which of these was initially available. Several did not respond to the initial e-mail at all, others replied that they would rather not be involved, mostly giving time constraint as their reason. One person immediately indicated difficulty in their marital communication for declining.

### 3.2.1.2 Further communications

If the reply seemed positive, a more detailed explanation of the study was sent to the prospective participants who were on e-mail. After a few days they were contacted again to find out if they were willing to participate. Often the spouse who received the message would say that he/she still needed to talk it over with the wife/husband. Either this person promised to e-mail the reply, or agreed to be e-mailed or be called again.

If they responded positively, those who were on e-mail, received the material in preparation for the interview electronically. The candidates who were not on e-mail received the material by regular mail. This included: A cover letter, an informed consent (if by regular mail, a return envelope was included), an instruction on the procedure for the interview, questionnaire 3 (marital commitment questionnaire), and questionnaire 4 (marital adjustment questionnaire).

For the participants that were reachable by regular mail, a sufficient time frame was allowed for mail delivery. At least ten to fourteen days after the mailing, they were contacted to find out if they had received the material.

Questionnaire 1 (demographic information) and 2 (church participation information) did not need to be sent. It took only about 5 to 7 minutes to administer these two directly by phone. By doing them over the phone, it reduced the intimidating bulk of material the participants needed to receive. On the other hand, it was necessary for the participants to have a copy of questionnaire 3 and 4 in front of them as they were being administered by phone. (Note: a copy of the informed consent, procedure information, and questionnaires 1, 2, 3 and 4 are included in the appendices of the dissertation).

The fourth contact was to confirm that they had received all the material and had agreed to the informed consent. At that point several interview time slots were offered

to them to choose from. Beyond those time slots, they could also suggest other time options. This contact was by e-mail or by phone.

One couple withdrew at this stage stating that the husband was not in agreement due to lack of time. Another couple backed out at this stage, because the wife was uncomfortable to be interviewed. They had marital conflicts and problems with their children. One couple simply did not answer any more communication after that.

When a certain hesitation was detected concerning the time choice, the interviewer called the participants, left a message on the answering machine or e-mailed them the day before the interview, to assure that they would remember the appointment.

In some instances, candidates e-mailed for changes of appointment. Thus, new arrangement of time needed to be made. Three couples were not available when they were called at the appointed interview time. They rescheduled. One of them rescheduled three times.

One couple rescheduled, because when they were called at the time of appointment, she was not feeling well and he was watching baseball on TV. At the time of the interview, the demographic questionnaire clarified that they had to drop out, because we needed to maintain consistency of the sample's description. They had not been married for at least 7 years.

Two couples withdrew when they were called for the interview. With one of them, the husband decided that they were too busy. The wife of the other couple stated that they would opt out because her husband was a "backslidden" Christian, meaning he had left the faith.

It can be said that those who followed through with the interview, tended to be pleasant and we had very friendly and open conversations. Though most were initially apprehensive about the expected one-hour commitment, they generally

enjoyed the conversation and forgot the passing of time. In some cases the interviewer had to remind the participant when time was up.

The total phone meeting lasted on the average one hour. The long-distance calls were done by Internet phone. At one occasion, the electricity went off ten minutes into the interview, which cut off the Internet connection. The interviewer immediately made an intercontinental long distance phone-call informing the participant of the situation. The participant was willing to postpone the interview for 15 minutes. During that time the electricity had returned. At another occasion, the communication was interrupted several times. The interviewer had to change the Internet server. However, 15 minutes toward to end of the conversation, the electronic connection was completely broken, so that the interview was finished by means of a long-distance phone call.

It is noteworthy that, two couples, that manifested having difficulties in their marriage, declined to participate. They might have felt uncomfortable, unqualified, or ashamed.

Also, even without having to fill out questionnaires as homework, the one-hour time commitment asked from the participants seemed to be a maximum requirement. Many initially expressed concern about the expected length of time, because they were busy people.

### **3.2.2 Process of the interview**

The spouses were each interviewed for about one hour. Their interviews were at different times of the same day, consecutively, or on different days. They were not to discuss or share the answers of the questionnaires until both had completed the interview, so that each partner could express his/her perspective. The actual phone interview follows the following order:

1. The interviewer initiated the phone call punctually according to the appointment. After a short moment spent in greetings to establish the relationship, the interviewer proceeded by asking the questions from questionnaires 1 and 2 (demographic information and church participation information). As the participant responded, the interviewer filled out the answers on her questionnaire sheet. This took between 5 - 7 minutes.
  
2. Then the interviewer asked the participants for the answers of questionnaire 3 (marital commitment questionnaire), followed by the answers to questionnaire 4 (marital adjustment questionnaire). The participants had their questionnaires in front of them. The interviewer read the statements or questions of the questionnaire one at a time. The participant communicated which number he/she circled to each item on his/her sheet. The interviewer circled the same answer on the item in her questionnaire sheet that is identical to that of the participant. This method was to by-pass the hindrances of distance and time, but at the same time there was a personal contact between the interviewer and the participants. If needed, the participants could ask what a word means. Also, bearing in mind that the Commitment Inventory (questionnaire 3) and the RDAS (Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale) (questionnaire 4) were not specifically constructed with intercultural couples' situation in mind, language difficulty could occur for some partners. Moreover, no specific attention was expected for the aspects of Evangelical religiosity and church participation in these two measurements. Nevertheless, they intend to assess the levels of the couples' marital commitment and adjustment.
  
3. The personal interview followed immediately after the completion of the questionnaires. The interviewer followed a guideline for the personal interview that contains twelve expandable questions (see 3.3.5 Personal Interview).

The personal interview was attentive to possible doubts or misunderstanding, and the previously mentioned limitations of the two instruments. Thus, in this study these two methods would be complementary to one another, although the personal interview took a more prominent place, because it allows insight into the relevance of the role of Biblical teaching and church participation in the couples' marriages.

It is noteworthy that at the beginning of filling out questionnaires 3 and 4, the participants were reminded that there was no right or wrong answer, and they were to do the best by giving the answer that came into mind. There was opportunity afterwards to clarify doubts or to comment. One wife gave up doing the two questionnaires due to language difficulties, but she was willing to continue with the personal interview. Even during the personal interview, she often resorted to use her native dialect.

### **3.3 Assessment Instruments**

Four questionnaires were used to help generate data pertinent to the purpose of the study. Questionnaire 1 focused on demographic information, questionnaire 2 on church involvement, questionnaire 3 on the marital commitment level, and questionnaire 4 on the marital adjustment level (all questionnaires are included in the appendices of the dissertation).

Subsequently, a personal interview was conducted to clarify aspects of conviction of Biblical teaching and church participation relative to their marital commitment, marital adjustment, and intercultural context.

#### **3.3.1 Questionnaire 1**

This questionnaire is to assess seven demographic items: 1. Age. 2. Educational background. 3. Cultural background. 4. Racial background. 5. Religious affiliation. 6. Length of time as Evangelical Christian. 7. Marriage information

(whether they were married before, how long they have been married, how many children, the age of the oldest and the youngest child).

The age of the oldest and the youngest child was to indicate their stage of raising children. The stresses of marriage life increase among couples with young children (Booth and White 1980; Olson et al. 1989), and peak at the stage when they have adolescent children (Olson et al. 1989).

Literature on intercultural couples report that there are added marital stresses because of ethnicity and culture with regard to children and childrearing issues (Markoff 1977; Sung 1990; Forna 1992).

On the other hand, childlessness can also be stressful on the marriage, if the spouses have not been able to accept their situation. Moreover, the Philippine culture assigns a high value to procreation and having many children (Andres and Andres 1987; Andres 1987; Matthews 1994; Panopio and Rolda 2000). Consequently, not only couples with young children or adolescents experience increased stresses, childlessness can test the marriage relationship.

Thus, questionnaire 1 confirmed that the couples fulfilled the criteria of being Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands who had been married long enough (at least seven years) that their commitment and adjustment process merited consideration for the study.

### **3.3.2 Questionnaire 2**

This questionnaire is to assess church participation activity. It is to secure information on the type and scope of the persons' involvement in receiving Biblical instruction in their church community and in serving in their church. Also, how regularly they share church participation as a couple. It makes the following inquiries: (1) how often they attend church on Sunday per month, (2) which church

activities they attend regularly, and (3) which church activities they attend jointly as a couple.

Several studies on same-culture couples reported the importance of religious commitment and church participation for the stability of marriage. Glock (1962) envisioned religious commitment to include dimensions of ideology (set of beliefs), religious practices (worship, prayer, participation in rituals), cognitive dimension (knowledge of basic tenets of Scriptures), and consequential dimension (ethics and works).

Hunt and King's study (1978), confirmed that there was a relationship between religiosity and marital success, although it only partially clarified the details of the relationship.

In Robinson's study (1994), religious orientation appeared to enhance communication. Also, the subjects experienced social, emotional or spiritual support. Religious faith served as means for guidance in dealing with decisions and conflicts. Further, church involvement provided friends and shared activities.

However, Booth et al. (1995) gave little support for the idea that an increase in religious activity improves marital relationship. They suggested the importance of intrinsic religious faith and church participation for marital happiness. They stated that religion and marital quality had a reciprocal but weak connection.

Ortega et al. (1988), Robinson (1994), and Wilson and Musick (1996) suggested the importance of shared church activities for marriage relationships. Also, in their study on the influence of religious homogamy, religious affiliation and church attendance on marital commitment, Larson and Goltz (1989) found that church attendance, duration of marriage and satisfaction with family life were the major predictors of structural commitment. In addition, Larson and Goltz reported that church attendance was likewise a major predictor of personal commitment in marriage.

The importance of church attendance was further brought out in Wilson et al. (1997). Their study on religious fundamentalists found that the frequency of church attendance increased exposure to like-minded people. Thus, frequency in church attendance reinforced more traditional family values in this group. Similarly, in the church where more liberal views were espoused, frequent church attendance increased the likelihood of more liberal family attitudes and behaviors. Thus, frequent church attendance serves as an environmental influence on the couples.

Moreover, it was important for both spouses to attend church together regularly. Call and Heaton (1997) wrote that the frequency of religious attendance had a positive impact on marital stability. When both spouses attended church regularly, the couple had the lowest risk of divorce. However, when spouses differed in church attendance, the risk of marital dissolution increased. Further, when one spouse attended church regularly, while the other never attended church, the likelihood for divorce was higher than when both spouses did not attend church at all.

In her study on Filipinas married to German men, Beer (1996) reports that the Filipinas' Roman Catholic religiosity is an asset for adjustment to the in-laws and their German community. This is when the Filipina, her husband and his family are similarly religious.

Thus, the information on frequency of church participation and joint involvement in religious activities among intercultural couples are relevant issues for questionnaire 2 to inquire.

### **3.3.3 Questionnaire 3**

Questionnaire 3 assesses the levels of marital commitment.

The review on marital commitment instruments suggested that there is no perfect measurement (Pramann 1986; Sabatelli and Cecil-Pigo 1985), however, the most suitable measurement instrument can be chosen for the purpose of the study (see 2.6.7).

Koehne (2000:22-24) proposes that there are three recurring dimensions of commitment in studies: 1. The attractive component that refers to the individual's commitment to his/her partner based on dedication, devotion, attachment, and love. 2. The external constraining dimension that may prevent marital dissolution, such as disapproval of friends, the cost of divorce, concern for the children and so forth. 3. The dimension of moral obligation, for instance, the belief in the sanctity of the marriage covenant. Thus, Koehne summarizes that couples may preserve their marriage because they want to (personal commitment), because they ought to (moral commitment), or because they have to (structural commitment).

In this regard, Stanley and Markman (1992) view commitment as two encompassing related constructs of personal dedication and constraint commitment.

Personal dedication refers to the desire to maintain or to improve the quality of relationship with the partner for joint benefit. It is evidenced by the desire and the behavior to continue the relationship and to improve it, to sacrifice for it, to invest in it, to connect it to personal goals, and not just to pursue one's own but to consider the partner's welfare.

On the other hand, constraint commitment refers to internal or external forces that constrain partners to maintain relationships regardless of their personal dedication. These pressures favor relationship stability. They hinder termination of a relationship by causing the break up to be economically, socially, personally, or psychologically more costly (Stanley and Markman 1992:596).

Also, the authors do not perceive constraint as necessarily a negative force. At times the feeling of satisfaction may not accompany the constraint commitment. For

example, older couples often report of how constraints help them maintain a long-term perspective along the way, and thus weather day-to-day conflicts. Now they score high on dedication, satisfaction and constraint. In other words, constraint may have a stabilizing role to play (Rusbult et al. 1982, in Stanley and Markman 1992:602).

The CI (Commitment Inventory) (Stanley and Markman 1992) intends to assess the levels of the couple's commitment on dedication and constraint, in which higher scores on these subscales means higher commitment and lower scores means lower commitment. Thus, Stanley and Markman's CI (1992) provides the source for Questionnaire 3 in this study.

Preliminary evaluation of the CI reports substantial reliability and validity. The internal consistencies for the subscales were also found adequate. Also, acceptable reliability coefficients result for both dedication and constraint overall scales. The following table shows the Coefficient Alphas for 12 subscales of the CI and average correlation of each subscale with the other 9 subscales. The subscales of Termination Procedures, and Unattractiveness of Alternatives were later eliminated following psychometric and theoretical examinations (Touliatos et al. 2001:119). The asterisks mark the subscales taken for the study.

Subscale	Alphas	Average correlation with 9 subscales
*Morality of divorce	.82	.30
Availability of partners	.80	.33
*Social pressure	.88	.52
Structural investments	.70	.20
Unattractiveness of alternatives		---
Termination procedures		---
Relationship agenda	.88	.56
Meta-commitment	.75	.39
*Couple identity	.81	.54
Primacy of relationship	.80	.56
*Satisfaction with sacrifice	.74	.46
Alternative monitoring	.86	.53

Touliatos et al. (2001) report that the Alpha of the CI ranges of from .74 to .88 for the ten subscales, with seven subscales reaching Alphas at or above .80. Alphas for the composite dimension of Dedication are at .95 and for Constraints .92. Average correlations of each subscale with the other subscales range from .20 to .56, while four of them achieve average correlations in the .20 to .39 range, and one correlating .46, and five subscales correlate from .52 to .56.

The whole CI consists of a 60 items Likert-type scale designed to assess the various dimensions of commitment in romantic relationships. It includes two primary

dimensions of personal dedication and constraint commitment, and ten subscales of six items each. The four subscales of the constraint dimension are: morality of divorce, availability of partners, social pressure, and structural investments. Six subscales describe the dimension of dedication: relationship agenda, metacommitment, couple identity, primacy of relationship, satisfaction with sacrifice, and alternative monitoring. Also, several items are presented in reversed form.

Subscale scores are calculated by summing or averaging items within the dimension. Higher scores mean higher levels of commitment. The composite scores for Dedication and Constraints are determined by averaging scores, or by z-score transformations of subscale scores.

There are several downsides of the CI that can be mentioned. Stanley and Markman (1992:603) acknowledge that the most important prediction about dedication and constraint could only be tested in longitudinal research. This study is not a longitudinal study. However, most of the couples have been married for a long time. Also, not all the CI subscales have been validated individually. In fact, two subscales were eliminated following psychometric and theoretical examinations. These were the subscales of unattractiveness of alternatives, and termination procedures (Touliatos et al. 2001:119).

Added to that, the CI as a whole is very lengthy. Stanley and Markman (1992) acknowledge that some subscales may be superfluous. They confirm that fewer subscales can capture the construct of dedication. Also, they state that their sampling was taken from a wide range of beliefs, but it was probably from a more religiously inclined segment of the general population.

The weakness of the CI as being lengthy may not be detrimental to this study. Literature indicates that not all subscales of the whole CI need to be used. In other words, certain subscales can be selected or eliminated based on the nature of the research. However, all the items for the subscales that are used, must be mixed in a

random order rather than presenting all items of one subscale in sequence (Stanley and Markman 1992:116; Touliatos et al. 2001:119). Therefore, only selected pertinent subscales were taken for Questionnaire 3.

Given that the study focuses on Evangelicals who regularly participate in church activities, the fact that the sample was more of the religiously inclined population would not be a problem.

Conversely, considering the context of Evangelical intercultural couples of a Philippine wife with North American Caucasian husband led to the following twofold rationale for selecting only 16 items of CI for questionnaire 3. Firstly, it was to avoid lengthiness, bearing in mind that the language may be intimidating, particularly for the spouse who is a foreign speaker of English. Secondly, the study considers the possibility that aspects of Biblical teaching, and intermarriage may be especially relevant in selected items of personal dedication and constraint commitment.

Stanley and Markman (1992:596) define Social pressure as pressures that others put on a couple to maintain their relationship, the most important of these come from friends and family. Morality of Divorce refers to the moral acceptability of divorce. Satisfaction with Sacrifice refers to the degree to which people feel a sense of satisfaction in doing things that are largely or solely for their partners' benefit. Couple Identity refers to the degree to which an individual thinks of the relationship as a team, in contrast to viewing it as two separate individuals, each trying to maximize individual gains.

Consequently, questionnaire 3 used two subscales for constraint commitment and two subscales for dedication commitment. For constraint, four items were for Morality of Divorce (MD). In this regard, consideration was given to the Evangelical religiosity, as well as Filipino cultural value against divorce. Four items were for Social Pressure (SP). The opinion of relatives and friends are very important, especially for the Philippine context. This is due to the Philippine core values of "pakikisama" (being

part of the group) and "hiya" (shame). Thus, there can be a constraint to behave unacceptably in the eyes of the group, or to violate socially approved conducts (Lynch 1962, 1973; Bulatao 1964; Agbayani-Siewart 2002). Added to that, Filipinos have a strong sense of familism (Andres and Andres 1987; Medina et al. 1996). Divorce is unacceptable.

For dedication commitment, four items are Couple Identity (CI) and four items are Satisfaction with Sacrifice (SS). Couple Identity may be tested because of the fact that the spouses come from different cultural and racial backgrounds. Satisfaction with Sacrifice may be related to Biblical teaching of unconditional love (Anderson and Guernsey 1985; Balswick and Balswick 1991; Worthington 1999), or the cultural value of reciprocity (Hollnsteiner 1964; Jocano 1997), or an attitude of forbearance (Panopio and Rolda 2000:81).

The intention of questionnaire 3 is to take note of the individual levels of commitment, and the differences of commitment levels between the wives and the husbands. In other words, low scores or a larger discrepancy between the partners' commitment levels would merit further investigation on the couple's relationship, and the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on their marital commitment. The Personal Interview provides further clarification.

Hence, the subscales of CI (Stanley and Markman 1992) were selected and arranged as follows:

1.	My friends would not mind it if my partner and I broke up	(SP -) (R 6)
2.	Except when a spouse dies, marriage should be a once-in-a-lifetime commitment.	(MD +) (R 10)
3.	I am willing to develop a strong sense of an identity as a couple with my partner.	(CI +) (R 15)
4.	I do not get much fulfillment out of sacrificing for my partner	(SS -) (R 16)
5.	I tend to think about how things affect "us" as a couple more than how things affect "me" as an individual.	(CI +) (R 11)

6.	My friends want to see my relationship with my partner continue.	(SP +) (R 1)
7.	A marriage is a sacred bond between two people, which should not be broken.	(MD +) (R 14)
8.	It makes me feel good to sacrifice for my partner.	(SS +) (R 12)
9.	My family really wants this relationship to work.	(SP +) (R 13)
10.	If a couple works hard at making their marriage work but find themselves incompatible, divorce is the best thing they can do.	(MD -) (R 2)
11.	I am more comfortable thinking in terms of "my" things than "our" things.	(CI -) (R 5)
12.	Giving something up for my partner is frequently not worth the trouble.	(SS -) (R 8)
13.	My family would not care if I ended this relationship.	(SP -) (R 9)
14.	It is all right for a couple to get a divorce if their marriage is not working out.	(MD -) (R 7)
15.	I do not want to have a strong identity as a couple with my partner.	(CI -) (R 3)
16.	I get satisfaction out of doing things for my partner, even if it means I miss out on something I want for myself.	(SS +) (R 4)

Note: (-) marks the presentation of the item in the negative form, while (+) is in the positive. "R" indicates the reverse form of the item. SP is "Social Pressure, MD is "Morality of Divorce", CI is "Couple Identity", and SS is "Satisfaction with Sacrifice". Items presented in the negative (-) are reversely scored, for example: 7=1, 6=2, 5=3, 3=5, 2=6, and 1=7.

The items are answered on a seven-point Likert scale, in which "1" is "strongly disagree" and "4" indicating, "neither agree nor disagree", while "7" is "strongly agree". Higher scores indicate greater levels of commitment. Subscales are scored by summing up and averaging items within the dimension. Composite scores for dedication and constraints are determined by averaging scores.

### 3.3.4 Questionnaire 4

Questionnaire 4 assesses the levels of marital adjustment. Gottman (1995:16) mentions that, based on 1989 study of the U. S. Census, 67 percent of recent first marriages ended in divorce. This means 2 out of 3 new marriages in the U. S. may end in divorce. In his opinion, how well one can handle inevitable differences in partnership, is the most important issue. In other words, the issue of compatibility for a good marriage is a myth. Contrary to David Olson's "PREPARE" that tests couples premaritally for similarities, Gottman (1995:23-24) believes that similarity of opinion among spouses does not safeguard the marriage against divorce. What is more relevant is the way couples work out their differences. Therefore, the issue of adjustment among the intercultural couples is of interest for this study.

In 1976 Spanier published an instrument for measuring adjustment in dyadic relationships called DAS (Dyadic Adjustment Scale). He subscribed to the notion that adjustment is an ever-changing process with a qualitative dimension that can be evaluated at any given point in time on a scale from well-adjusted to maladjusted. Thus, dyadic adjustment can be defined as a process, the outcome of which is determined by the degrees of: (1) troublesome dyadic differences, (2) interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety, (3) dyadic satisfaction, (4) dyadic cohesion, and (5) consensus on matters of importance to dyadic functioning (Spanier 1976:17). After further analysis, three of the original five hypothesized components were confirmed. These are dyadic satisfaction, dyadic consensus, and dyadic cohesion (Spanier 1976:21).

However, literature shows that there was a controversy surrounding the question of whether the DAS (Dyadic Adjustment Scale) of Spanier (1976) is a one-dimensional global measure or a multidimensional instrument (Busby et al. 1995:292). The original definition of dyadic adjustment was multidimensional (Spanier and Cole 1975; Spanier 1976). Busby et al. (1995) subscribed that it was the subscales of the DAS that made the instrument unique. Therefore, they considered it appropriate to

improve this measurement, so that the subscales are valid, rather than suggesting it to be a global instrument.

They maintained that the problems with the subscales of the DAS could be understood and corrected by analyzing the issues of construct hierarchy. Thus, they revised the subscales by using hierarchical confirmatory factor analysis to clarify the dimensional structure. RDAS (Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale) also called ADAS (Adapted Dyadic Scale) (Busby et al. 1995) consist of only 14 items, while the DAS has 32 items. However, the more compact form has a high correlation with the original DAS, and its potential use as balanced subscales increases its value in research studies (Touliatos et al. 2001:81).

The adapted or revised instrument has three higher-order concepts of marital quality: consensus, satisfaction, and cohesion. Within these higher-order scales there are seven subscales, each consisting of two items. Within consensus there are decision-making, values and affection subscales. Further, imbedded in satisfaction there are stability and conflict. Cohesion includes activities and discussion subscales. However, only the structure of three higher-order subscales has been reported as psychometrically evaluated (Touliatos et al. 2001:81). The questions of the RDAS are grouped by subscales in the following way:

### *Consensus*

#### Decision Making

Item 3. Making major decisions

Item 6. Career decisions

#### Value

Item 1. Religious matters

Item 5. Conventuality (correct or proper behavior)

#### Affection

Item 2. Demonstration of affection

Item 4. Sex relation

*Satisfaction*

Stability

Item 7. How often do you discuss terminating your relationship?

Item 9. Do you ever regret that you married?

Conflict

Item 8. How often do you and your partner quarrel?

Item 10. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves"?

*Cohesion*

Activities

Item 11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?

Item 13. How often do you work together on a project?

Discussion

Item 12. How often do you have a stimulating exchange of ideas?

Item 14. How often do you calmly discuss something?

Of the 14 items, 13 have 6-point response scales, and 1 has a 5-point scale. Response categories are assigned a value from 0 to 5, or 0 to 4, and they are summed up for total score.

The Alpha reliability of the 14 items measurement is at .90, with each of the three subscales yielding Alpha reliability coefficient of .80 or greater. The correlation between the revised and the original DAS is at .97. Thus, dropping 18 items from the DAS had little effect on the scores (Touliatos et. al 2001:82).

Busby et al. (1995: 303) shows the Cronbach's Alpha (internal consistency) reliability coefficients of the RDAS as follows:

Dyadic Consensus subscale	.81
Dyadic Satisfaction subscale	.85
Dyadic Cohesion subscale	.80
Total Revised DAS	.90

In this study questionnaire 4 makes use of the RDAS in order to indicate the levels of marital adjustment of the spouses in the sample.

### **3.3.5 Personal interview**

The personal interview was intended to discuss features of the relationship that were relevant to the study, which were not brought out by questionnaire 3 and 4. These were the aspects of marital commitment and marital adjustment in relation to the participants' conviction of Biblical teaching and church participation, and their intercultural marriage situation. Also, it allowed an opportunity for the participants to clarify possible doubts or misunderstanding about the items on the questionnaires.

The personal interview started with question A (connecting with questionnaire 3 and 4): “Which question/questions stood out because it was hard to answer, ambiguous or you feel like expanding your answer?” In order to facilitate a fluent conversation, the rest of the questions were not necessarily asked in their order of sequence, but they were asked following the natural flow of the conversation. However, all twelve questions on the list were treated. During the interview the answers were jotted down on a pad. As soon as possible after the interview they were typed into the computer in their proper order.

The questions touched on the following issues: How they met, their expectation for choice of a church, the contribution of their church to the well-being of their marriage, the relationship with the in-laws, leadership in the home (gender-role), their position on divorce and sacrificial love, the value of having children, and their frequent issues and way of dealing with differences. The twelve principal questions were:

A. *Connecting with Questionnaire 3 and 4.*

Which question/questions stood out because it was hard to answer, ambiguous or you feel like expanding your answer?

B. *How They Met.*

1. Where did you meet your husband/wife?
2. Have you been back in the Philippines/ U.S.A. since you were married?

C. *Expectation for Choice of a Church.*

1. What were your criteria for choosing to be member of this church?
2. Why did you choose to be member of a Filipino church or white church?

D. *The Contribution of Their Church to the Well-being of their Marriage.*

What benefits for the well-being of your marriage do you experience in your church?

E. *Relationship with In-laws.*

1. Is your family on both sides Evangelical Christians?
2. How do you relate to your in-laws? (Do you feel accepted? Is your spouse accepted in your family? Are the in-laws intruding in your marriage and family affairs?)

F. *Leadership in the Home (Gender-Role).*

1. Who is the leader in your home? (Is this based on common sense, Biblical principle, or model of parents, or culture?).
  - 2.1 Who is the one who disciplines the children in your home?
  - 2.2 Who makes the decisions on children's education?
3. Who manages the money in your home (who carries the purse)? (Is it based on Biblical teaching, common sense, parents' model or culture?).

G. *Position on Divorce and Sacrificial Love.*

1. What is your position on divorce? (Is it based on Biblical teaching, common sense, culture or parental model?) (The question includes position of divorce due to abandonment, abuse, adultery and their view on remarriage).
2. How would you explain sacrificial love?

H. *Perspective on the value of Children.*

How do you decide on the size of the family? (Will you be happier as a family with many children or as a family with fewer children?) (Is it based on Biblical teaching, common sense or role model in your family or culture?)

I. *Dealing with Differences.*

1. What is the frequent issue of disagreement?
2. How do you express when you are upset?
3. How do you resolve disagreements?
4. Who apologizes or asks for forgiveness more often? (Is it based on Biblical teaching, parents' role model, culture or common sense?)

Note: "Common sense" means: It is not by direct influence of certain Biblical teaching, or culture, but based on what one considers as sound or reasonable judgment.

The questions were selected because of the following rationale:

*Question A* is to allow opportunity to the participants for airing their doubts, or to expand more on their answers of questionnaires 3 and 4, if they wish to do so. It can also help clarify possible misunderstanding of the questions when they filled out the questionnaires.

*Question B* is to find out how the relationship started, and if they maintain ties to the relatives in the Philippines, or in North America, depending where they live now.

Questions A and B, are more preliminary in nature

*Question C* is to learn about the type of congregation that attracts the intercultural couples, and what makes them feel belonging and what would not.

Heitink (1993:277) recommends that in ecclesiastics, in order to give full attention to the way in which the church functions, one needs to think in terms of problem definition, diagnosis, and goal. Thus, we want to know if there is a problem of acceptance or feeling accepted in the church among the intercultural couples in the study, or what condition in a church would make them feel accepted.

Prinzing and Prinzing (1991) suggest that there are "mixed messages" from the Evangelicals with regard to Black and White intermarriage. The church has given token and theoretical support to interracial and intercultural marriage, but many church families transmit different messages (Prinzing and Prinzing 1991:105).

However, with regard to a Biblical view on intermarriage, literature on the OT suggests that prohibition of exogamy of the Israelites with pagan gentiles was for the preservation of the people of God and their faithfulness to Him (Epstein 1942; Werman 1997; Hayes 1999; Rudolph 1949; Sailhamer 1992), while the NT clearly underlines the nature of universality and unity of the church. Calvin argued that the church universal is the multitude collected out of all nations, who though dispersed and far distant from each other, agree in one truth of divine doctrine and are bound together by the tie of common religion (Institutes of Religion, Book IV, Chap. 1, section 9).

In the NT, believers of all cultures, races or gender are considered as equals in Jesus Christ (Gal 3:26- 29; Col 3:11; Eph 4:1-6). Jesus desires that all who believe in him may be one (Jn 17:20-23) (see Erickson 1989:1035, 1037; NAE statement of faith).

Both Berkhof (1979:396) and Tidball (1995:47) stress the need for inclusiveness of people of all walks of life, races and gender as the distinctive feature of the Christian communion.

Thus, question C anticipates some information on the conditions in the church that could promote a sense of belonging and unity of the people within the bond of common faith, so that the reality can come closer to the ideal. This relates to the first point in the theological consideration of the thesis: unity of believers in Jesus Christ (see 1.3.1 The universality and unity of believers in Jesus Christ).

*Question D* focuses on how these intercultural marriages can be supported and strengthened in the church. Is the concept of a surrogate sibling bond of the early

church relevant to the situation of the intercultural marriage today (Hellerman 2001)? De Jongh van Arkel (1992:75-76) affirms that the concept of the church as a caring family is not expected to be obsolete. Mutual care embodies "ekklesia" and "koinonia" that includes mutual support and encouragement, guidance, accountability and honest communication, and interest in one another and mutual appreciation (de Jongh van Arkel 1992:97-98).

For Firet (1986:75), mutual paraklesis entails far more than an experience of group loyalty or a sense of community. It is essential for participation in salvation, and for life in "the consolation of Christ". Thus, it means living in responsibility for one another. In this regard, Tidball (1995:46) states that the church should be the best therapeutic community in the world, because it emphasizes acceptance (Ro 12:3-7), forgiveness (Eph 4:32), compassion (Phil 2:1; Col.3:12), and unconditional and divine love (Jn 13:34-35; Ro 12:9-10; 1 Cor 13; Gal 5: 13-14).

Erickson (1989:1051-1067) suggests evangelism, edification, worship and social concern as part of the roles of the church. Particularly, edification and worship are of interest to our topic of intercultural couples' receiving Biblical teaching, and participating actively in the church community. Erickson points out that God gives various gifts to the church for the equipping of the saints, for the work of ministry, and for the building up of the body of Christ (Eph 4:12). Believers are to grow up together into Christ (Eph 4:16). He perceives koinonia as one of the means of edification. Acts 5 shows it in the form of having everything in common. In 1 Cor 12:26, the believers are to share in suffering, honor and joy, and in Gal 6:2 they are to bear one another's burden.

Further, the writer proposes that Matt 18:15-17 and 1 Cor 5:1-2 imply the aspect of correction in edification of the church. Discipleship includes instruction or teaching (Matt 28:20). Also, God gives the church gifts of "pastors and teachers" (Eph 4:11). In addition, he includes preaching or prophesying as means of edification.

Another aspect of the role of the church is worship. Although worship focuses on God, while edification on the believers, worship also edifies the believers (Heb 10:25). Erickson points out that Paul warns against prayers, songs, and thanksgiving that do not edify (1 Cor 14:15-17). Thus, in worship church members exalt God and edify one another (Erickson 1989:1057).

Therefore, question D contemplates the possibility that the intercultural couples may be edified not only through the preaching, but also by the support of pastoral care and participation in the fellowship, so that their marriages are strengthened (see 1.3.4 The relevance of mutual care and church participation).

*Question E* seeks information on the religious background of the participants' family and the relationship with the in-laws. The Filipino family system is markedly bilateral and with closely knit extended family ties (Church 1986:55-56). This is also mentioned in Hart (1980) and Matthews (1994). For this reason, it is a common understanding in the Philippine culture that when one marries, it is a marriage into a family, rather than just to the individual.

Added to that, children have the obligation to respect and obey their parents and to show their gratitude by taking care of them in their old age (Hollnsteiner 1964:32). This agrees with the Filipino value of "utang na loob" (reciprocity). It is in stark contrast to North American values of independence and self-reliance (Church 1986:44).

Moreover, Romano (2001:97-102) writes that couples in an intercultural marriage not only get a set of foreign in-laws; but that they may also wed a totally absorbing concept of family, which will have a great bearing on how they live their married lives. Thus, she submits that these intercultural differences make for quite diverse interpretations of how to handle and relate to in-laws.

Medina (1995:178-179) attributed problems with in-laws as the most frequent issue encountered in research on Filipino marital adjustment because of the closely-knit extended family system. Often, comparing each other's family life style, values, and the extreme loyalty to family of origin can be reasons for disagreements between spouses. Also, complications can arise when the in-laws consciously or unconsciously manipulate or control the lives of their children and grandchildren.

Also, Lapuz (1977:50) mentions that family solidarity and a closely-knit extended family system are a salient source for problems with in-laws, even though these close family ties are for providing material and emotional security.

Thus, the question is on how these intercultural couples understand and handle spousal unity and priority of loyalty to the spouse over loyalty to their family of origin.

Beside the intercultural features in marital relationship, the question asks for information on the religious background of both sides of the family. It can clarify if the faith of the family of origin has a bearing on the couple's religious belief and church participation.

*Question F* intends to shed light on salient aspects of gender-role in their interaction, and whether these were based on Biblical teaching, parental modeling, culture, common sense, or other influences. Imamura (1986 b) maintains that data from intercultural marriage situation are particularly useful, because differences of role expectation in the spouses' societies are often more readily apparent than in intranational marriages. Mutual understanding and adjustment of role expectation is likely to be relevant for the success of the marriage (Imamura 1986:46).

Although North American Evangelical Christian writers agree that the concept of Christian marriage comes from the Bible, and the Scripture discusses the topic in many passages, yet there are continued differences of opinions concerning biblical

interpretation on husband and wife's roles. In this regard, Evangelicals support either the traditional (submission/hierarchical), or the equality (mutuality), or even the continuum positions. Supporters of the first mentioned model subscribe to a hierarchical structure of authority in the family. The husband is the head of the home according to God's plan (e.g. Christenson 1970; Gangle 1972; Getz 1972; Hendricks 1973). The proponents of the equality (mutuality) model are for instance, Gundry (1977, 1980), and Clinebell (1970). This position perceives husband and wife as equals and they function as mutual partners in marriage roles. The continuum model proposes that husband and wife's role can be of both equality and submission style. Their role can fluctuate on the continuum between the hierarchical and equality poles. Marital roles can be a blending of the two styles. Parental models, personality and temperament, religious teaching, and personal experience may influence the way the couple relates (see 2.3.3 The role of husband and wife).

With our sample, beside the fact that there are different views in gender-roles in the North American context, the spouses come from two different cultures. Therefore, it is of interest to inquire how these couples establish their gender-role practices.

Owing to its Malay cultural root, the Philippine social system is internally matriarchal, but externally patriarchal by the influence of foreign colonization (Hart 1980; Andres and Andres 1987). The Spanish colonization, that started in the middle of the 16th century and lasted over three hundred years, brought Spanish Catholicism and several other features of the Spanish culture into the Philippines. Thus, the patriarchal system became included in the Filipino culture.

Consequently, Medina (1991:121-125) writes about the position of Filipino women as projecting "a double vision of machismo and egalitarian". One cannot consistently view it as following the characteristics of machismo, nor that of egalitarian gender role. Zaide (1998:34) states that despite the description of the Filipino family as patriarchal, the "dictum is more of an illusion than a reality". The mother plays a vital role in decision making in the family.

Also, literature indicates that hierarchical authority is based on age and generational respect in the Filipino culture (Hart 1980:774; Andres and Andres 1987). However, authority based on gender hierarchy is not an issue in Filipino publications.

Porio, Lynch and Hollnsteiner's study (1978) support the concept of egalitarian decision-making style of Filipino husbands and wives. They specify that the couple deliberate as a team in decision making on the disciplining of children, children's education, and family investment. The wife alone is most frequently responsible for handling the household budget and expenditures. The findings agree with the earlier studies of Guerrero (1965), Liu and Yu (1968), and Mendez and Jocano (1974). A more recent publication (Go 1993) indicates that several Filipino cultural features persist into the 1990s. These are for instance, interdependence and reciprocal indebtedness ("utang na loob"), familism, hierarchy of generational respect, and husband-wife egalitarian role. There is a division of domain in decision making between husband and wife. Agbayani-Siewart (1995:169) wrote that family authority among the Filipinos is not patriarchal, but more egalitarian. Husband and wife share equally in financial and family decisions.

Andres (1987:31) affirms the egalitarianism between husband and wife in many ways. The husband is the breadwinner and the wife, the treasurer. The father takes care of disciplinary problems of the children and the wife takes care of the house and the rearing of the children. Both father and mother exercise authority over their children. Decisions are the results of mutual agreement between husband and wife. Further, Andres and Andres (1987:50) write that the wife holds the purse, the husband hands over his paycheck and gets an allowance in return, and the wife manages the affairs of the household.

Both Andres (1987:43) and Zaide (1998:34) agree that the typical Filipino husband hands over his income to his wife, and she takes care of managing the family funds.

However, this is changing. Currently, many wives have taken on paying jobs to help their husbands provide for the family.

With regards to decision-making, the husband makes major decisions in the home such as when buying a property, investing in stocks, or building a house.

Nevertheless, on matters related to the children, decisions are made in consultation with the wife (Zaide, 1998:34).

Zaide also writes that the wife uses the husband as a sort of "bogyman" (threat) in disciplining the children. He is the main source of discipline. In other words, when the children misbehave, the wife can resort to threatening: "Wait till your father comes home!"

Overall, it may be said that in spite of the existence of "double standard" and "machismo", there have not been obvious struggles over gender issues in the Philippines. Simmons (2001:188) reports on her interview with Elena Samonte, a well-known psychologist, researcher and professor of the University of the Philippines. Samonte asserted that she had not yet seen the feminist movement affecting Filipino women, although many wanted changes to what they have been socialized with. According to Estrada-Claudio (1990) feminism as a social change is not as obvious in the Philippines as in the West. It exists mainly in the universities and among social service organizations working with women and abuse issues.

In contrast, the position on gender-role in North America is diverse. There is a continued debate between the traditional and the liberal gender and family values. Bert Adams (1980) points out that American families are divided between the traditional type that is mostly among the working and lower class, and the middle-class families, which are closer to "choice-blurred" egalitarian. In other words, among the middle-class families, gender role is less clearly defined, because they tend to choose their own relational practices. D'Antonio (1983:85) explains that there has been a notable decline in patriarchal authority in recent years. While the members of

the family are not yet equal in role, they are not as unequal as they were a century ago. Thus, the North American value of patriarchy has been challenged.

Similarly, Browning et al. (1997:8-9) found among other data, that couples today believe that they enjoy more mutuality and are less self-sacrificial than their parents. They see their roles more flexible than those of their parents, though wives today are still more tied to domestic responsibilities than are husbands. Couples today think their mothers were much more inclined to see their role at home either as full-time or part-time. They share access to bank accounts and checkbooks more than their mothers. Couples think they share more completely in the raising and disciplining of children than did their parents.

Thus, in spite of the continued debate on the different gender-role perspectives, Browning et al. (1997) seem to suggest that in reality society and culture in North America has changed towards equality.

However, Hardgrove (1983), Airhart et al. (1996), Bartowski (2001), Bendroth (2002), all agree that denominations cannot uniformly be labeled liberal or conservative in relation to Protestant family values. Bartowski (2001) maintains that concerning gender issues and family values, the American Evangelical scene is heterogeneous, even within one denomination.

Noteworthy is Brinkerhoff and Mackie's study (1985) published in Bahr (1991) that investigated students' view on religion and gender in the U. S. and in Canada. They found that religiosity led to increases in traditional attitude in both groups.

In short, among the Evangelicals in North America there is not one particular view on gender-role that can represent the Evangelicals as a whole.

*Question G* attempts to look into the spouses' position on the issue of divorce and sacrificial love, and whether Biblical teaching, culture, parental modeling or other

experiences were influential in establishing their view. In other words, it is to verify how the Biblical concept of marriage as a covenant and unconditional other-oriented love are affirmed in the marital relationship of the couples studied.

North American Evangelical theologians are divided on their view of the breakability or permanency of the marital covenant based on their interpretation of certain key passages in the Bible (e. g. Gen 2:24; Dt 24:1-4; Matt 19:3-12, particularly v. 9; 1 Cor 7, primarily v. 5, 10, 11, and 15) (see 2.3.2 Covenant commitment in marriage).

There are four prominent positions on divorce and marriage among theologians: (1) “No divorce and no remarriage”; (2) “Divorce but no remarriage”; (3) “Divorce and remarriage for adultery or desertion”; and (4) “Divorce and remarriage under a variety of circumstances” (House 1990).

The issue of marital commitment and sacrificial or unconditional love in marriage is related to the discussion of the concept of Christian marriage as a covenant union. One of the distinctions between covenant and contract is that in a covenant, there is no place for negotiation. The one, who is in the greater position for expressing grace, offers his/her part as a "gift". Negotiation is descriptive of contract. The most striking aspect of covenant is personal loyalty and permanency. Contract requires fulfillment of terms and it is usually for a specified period of time (Martens 1994).

Anderson and Guernsey (1985:47) postulate that covenant or commitment to the relationship is something one gives to the other that cannot be taken away once it is given. Balswick and Balswick (1991) are among many Evangelical writers who promote the centrality of the concept of covenant in Biblical Theology of marriage. Their view agrees with Martens' theological concept of covenant (1994), and with Anderson and Guernsey's discussion of covenant commitment (1985). Similarly, Worthington (1999: 70) states that in Christian covenantal marriage commitment, the partners feel that the marriage is sacred. Thus, the concept of covenant marriage is

inclusive of unconditional giving love and permanent commitment, such as expressed in Eph 5:25.

In spite of the on-going theological debate on the issue of divorce and remarriage, on Nov. 14, 2000, representatives of both the Roman Catholic and Evangelical churches in America jointly published a manifesto: "A Christian Declaration on Marriage". In this declaration they affirm that marriage is to last for a lifetime. They believe that in marriage many principles of the Kingdom of God are manifested. The interdependence of a healthy Christian community is clearly exemplified in loving one another (Jn 13:34), forgiving one another (Eph 4:32), and confessing to one another (Eph 5:21). These principles find unique fulfillment in marriage. Marriage is God's gift, a living image of the union between Christ and His church (see Appendices: *A Christian Declaration on Marriage*).

In the predominantly Roman Catholic Philippines, marriage is considered a sacrament. Once marriage is considered sexually consummated, it is permanent until death. The sacramental view believes that marriage is indissoluble and divorce does not break a marriage. Remarriage before the spouse is deceased means adultery or polygamy, unless the marriage merits to be annulled (Clark 1995:23).

Thus, in the mainstream Philippine culture, divorce is socially unbecoming. The *Catechism for Filipinos Catholics* (1997) item 1915 affirms that marriage is indissoluble. It states that marriage demands total fidelity from the spouses and it requires an unbreakable unity between them. Matt 19:6 is quoted here, as Christ's prophetic, messianic proclamation that God's saving activity was already present through his ministry. The hardness of heart (Matt 19:8) could be softened through the grace and power of Jesus Christ. Therefore, permanent conjugal love must be possible.

Added to that, the current Philippine codes on legal separation and annulment lean heavily on the sacramental view. Divorce is not legally permitted (*Family Code of*

*the Philippines, annotated, rev. ed. 2000*). This view is reflected in literature on intercultural marriage of Filipinas with foreign men of various nationalities. However, the publications only mention Roman Catholic Filipinas. Their Roman Catholic religiosity is reported as the salient factor that supported or kept them in the marriage (Samonte 1992, 1994; Beer 1996; Bauzon 1999; Simmons 2001).

Moreover, literature on Philippine values mentions the Filipinas' self-sacrificing attitude for the sake of the family and to make up for their husbands deficiencies (Bustos and Espiritu 1996:89). Panopio and Rolda (2000:81) explain the attitude of "pagtitiis" (patiently suffering or forbearance). "Pagtitiis" is an attitude that is expressed when certain frustrating forces are too powerful to overcome. These may be poverty, injustices, sickness, or anything else. The stress on "pagtitiis" is reflected by the prevailing double standards of morality. The woman's primary duty is to care for her husband and her children. The women, more than the men, are expected to patiently suffer for the sake of the family.

Furthermore, the *Catechism for Filipino Catholics* (1997:14) mentions "kundiman-oriented" (suffering love oriented) as one of the characteristics of the Filipinos. It states that Filipinos are naturally attracted to heroes sacrificing everything for love. Also, an Evangelical writer (Rempola 2005:195) discusses "Kundiman" as a genre of Filipino folk love song. He states that Filipinos turn in time of crisis to the "kundiman love-song" genre for comfort, release, and the expression of their hope for a better future. Filipino Christians have also instinctively sung "kundiman" or created new songs in this genre as their own unique and Christian response to crisis. These new compositions have served as songs of comfort that assured them of God's mercy and dependability in the midst of trials and sufferings (Rempola 2005:204).

The attitudes of "pagtitiis" and "kundiman" may suggest the presence of self-sacrificial love in the culture, whether it is biblical or purely cultural in nature. Therefore, it is interesting to learn whether among the couples studied, the idea of sacrificial love is biblical (e.g. Eph 5:25) or simply a cultural virtue.

In contrast, literature on North American values underlines the cultural features of individualism, independence and equality (D'Antonio 1983; Hall and Hall 1987; Steward and Bennet 1991; Blankston 1999; Althen 2003). Presumably, such values are not naturally conducive to facilitating submission, and the sacrificing of oneself for the other's interest. Therefore, the impact of Biblical teaching on sacrificial love could be more apparent.

*Question H* aims at clarifying how the participants view the importance of having many children, and their basis for deciding on the size of the family. Raising children can also increase marital stresses, especially for intercultural couples (Markoff 1977; Sung 1990; Forna 1992). Thus, their answer to this question could reflect how they made adjustment on this issue.

Several studies have shown that Filipinos are now shifting to modern attitudes toward preference for smaller family size. In spite of this growing modern attitude, the large family norm still persists. Several values associated with the importance of having many children are: Children are "gifts" of God. Children bring happiness to parents, siblings and other relatives. Children are economic assets and investments for old age. Children are public evidences of maleness and fulfillment of motherhood. Children are evidences of love and a strengthening force in marriage and family. Children (sons) continue the family name. Children allow a second chance to have parents' ambitions and dreams vicariously satisfied. Children can enhance parental prestige (Andres 1987: 27-31).

Furthermore, the prominence of children is related to the significance of kinship ties and familism in the Filipino bilateral extended family system. Matthews (1994) argues that children play a central and symbolic role in the kinship relationship. Their birth, the religious and social rituals that involve their life, nurture the kinship and "compadrazgo" (extended family network). Filipinos establish, maintain and affirm their notions of personhood and identity by means of having children.

Matthews states that children are reasons for the celebration of community and culture. He suspects that this custom may be the hindrance to family planning programs in the Philippines. Conceivably, while raising children can be stressful, childlessness can also be a burden to the marriage.

While North Americans also consider children as important and valuable, they seem to be more gauged by the awareness of the responsibility of having children. Althen (2003:13-14) indicates that Americans have a mixed or ambivalent opinion about the value of children. They know that having children is a great responsibility. It entails work, inconvenience and expense. Further, the nuclear family system predominates in North American culture. Each couple must be responsible for the care of their children, whereas in the Filipino culture couples can count on their extended family support system.

Related to the high value of individualism and independence, the North American society also highly estimates the value of privacy. Therefore, children are brought up to be independent. Each child preferably has its own bedroom and keeps its belongings there (Athen 2003:13-14). Thus, having many children can be inconvenient.

Further, the expense of having children is a point for consideration. Althen mentions that the American media frequently provide reports on studies estimating the cost of raising children. The conclusion of such a study indicates a specific dollar amount parents should expect to spend if they have a child. Consequently, in North America, people may view children not only as blessings but also as financial burden.

Thus, the study inquires about what is the influencing factor on the intercultural couples' view for the size of the family: their religion, culture, or simply common sense.

*Question I* is to contribute to the insight into the couples' significant marital adjustment issues, their method of dealing with them, and whether Biblical teaching, cultural or family background is influential in their way of making up with one another. Specifically, the question seeks information on the frequent issues of disagreement, their expression of anger (upset), how they find solution to the impasse, and how they seek forgiveness or apologize.

Romano (2001:212) concludes that some intercultural couples know how to fight constructively, while others do not. The latter see themselves sinking into whirlpools of endless misunderstanding and conflict. However, for those who choose this relationship there are techniques that can be practiced for improving communication. She also writes that fair fights can be healthy. They show that the partners are searching for a solution that works for both. Gottman (1994:23-24) reports that his research showed how couples work out their differences is much more important than having compatibility. He adds that marital bliss and perfect compatibility are not the only glue that holds couples together, and it may not be the most important glue. Thus, if many same-culture marriages dissolve due to incompatibility, it would be worthwhile to find out whether certain Biblical relational values could be helpful in the way Evangelical intercultural couples work out their differences.

The Christian manifesto on marriage (Nov. 14, 2000) referred to earlier, mentions such Biblical values as: "loving one another (Jn 13:34), forgiving one another (Eph 4:32), confessing to one another (Eph 5:21), which find unique fulfillment in Christian marriage". *Question I* may shed light into the application of these values among the couples studied.

### **3.3.6 Analysis**

These interviews are analyzed. Questions C (Expectation for choice of a church) and D (Contribution of their church to the well-being of the marriage) contribute to the

answer of research question 2: How does church participation influence marital commitment and marital adjustment of the intercultural couple?

Questions E (Relationship with the in-laws), F (Leadership in the home), G (Position on divorce and sacrificial love), H (Perspective on the value of children), and I (Dealing with differences) are responsive to research questions 1: How does Biblical teaching influence marital commitment and adjustment of the intercultural couple?

Questionnaire 1 furnishes the demographic information on the participants.

Questionnaire 2 shows the levels of church participation. The scores of questionnaire 3 display the levels of marriage commitment, and questionnaire 4 the levels of marital adjustment of the Evangelical intercultural sample of Filipina wives and their North American Caucasian husbands.

The results of the personal interviews yield more specific information on the state of the influence of Biblical teaching, and the benefits of church participation on marital commitment and marital adjustment of the intercultural couples.

### **3.4 Results**

In this section, the report will begin with the results of questionnaire 1, followed by those of questionnaires 2, questionnaire 3, and questionnaire 4. It will culminate with the result of the personal interview.

Data from questionnaire 1 presents a demographic description of the 23 Evangelical intercultural Filipina – North American Caucasian couples. The results of questionnaire 2 indicate the extent of the couples' church participation. The scores of questionnaire 3 intend to show the level of constraint and dedication commitment in marriage. The results of questionnaire 4 are to show the couples' level of marital adjustment in the areas of consensus, satisfaction, and cohesion.

While the data of the questionnaires are helpful, it is the personal interview that provides insight into the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on the intercultural couples' marital commitment and adjustment. It particularly discloses the relevance of the kind of church they feel comfortable with and how it benefits their marriage, their adjustment to the intercultural in-law relationship, gender-role practices, the value of children, and the basis for their values on the permanence of marital commitment and of sacrificial love.

Lastly, the personal interview reveals what the frequent day-to-day disagreements are as Evangelical couples of Filipina wife with North American Caucasian husband, and their style of dealing with the differences. It is significant for this study whether Biblical teaching, culture, parental modeling, or just personality is the foundation for forgiving one another and making adjustment.

Certain data of the couples that currently live in North America and those in the Philippines, are separated to distinguish possible local influencing factors such as: maintaining ties with relatives in the country of origin, experiencing the contribution of their church for the well-being of the marriage, the functioning of gender-role, the value of children, and the frequent issues of disagreements.

### 3.4.1 The results of the questionnaires

#### Questionnaire 1 (Demographic data)

##### Q1

CODE	Age	Edu.	Y. in faith	Y. of mar	Num child	Oldest	Youngest	CODE	Age	Edu.	Y. in faith	Nu of mar
W1	36	4	25	12	2	10	5	H1	44	5	37	1
W2	46	4	36	13	0			H2	43	4	20	1
W3	35	3	5	15	3	15	4	H3	43	4	6	1
W4	40	4	10	15	3	11	8	H4	38	4	10	1
W5	41	4	6	20	2	14	10	H5	44	5	6	1
W6	59	5	30	28	2	26	24	H6	56	4	34	1
W7	64	4	45	37	1	33		H7	63	5	58	1
W8	45	3	30	12	2	8	7	H8	47	4	47	1
W9	58	4	24	24	2	22	20	H9	58	4	52	1
W10	41	5	10	11	1	3		H10	45	4	20	1
W11	44	5	14	21	2	13	11	H11	49	4	33	1
W12	55	5	38	15	0			H12	54	5	43	1
W13	36	4	15	15.5	4	12	1	H13	36	5	7	1
W14	39	4	8	15	2	8	3	H14	43	4	8	1
W15	37	4	14	10	2	7	4	H15	55	5	44	1
W16	40	4	32	16	2	10	8	H16	40	4	31	1
W17	44	4	25	19	3	18	11	H17	43	4	35	1
W18	46	4	20	19	2	17	14	H18	48	4	34	1
W19	33	4	8	7.5	0			H19	53	5	53	3
W20	53	4	33	20	0			H20	85	4	40	2
W21	51	4	27	12	0			H21	56	4	30	1
W22	39	5	25	7.25	3	6	1.5	H22	39	5	29	1
W23	50	4	34	17	1	10		H23	50	5	38	1
Average	44.9	4.1	22.3	16.6	1.7	14.2	9.3		49.2	4.4	31.1	1.1

Note:

"W" stands for wife and "H" for husband

Education:

1. Elementary School
2. Junior H.S gr. 6 - 8
3. High School gr. 9 - 12
4. College
5. Post College education

#### Age of marriage

The oldest among the wives is 64 yrs; the youngest is 33 yrs. While 13 of them (56.5%) married in their 20s, 9 (39.1%) married in their 30s, and 1 (4.3%) married when she was 40. The shortest time of having been married is 7.25 years, and the longest is 37 yrs. All the women are in their first marriage.

The oldest among the husbands is 85 yrs, and the youngest is 36 yrs.

Twenty-one of them (91.3%) are in their first marriage, but one husband (4.3%) is in his third marriage after 2 divorces. Another one (4.3%) is in his second marriage

having been a widower. Ten of the men (43.4%) first married after they were 30 yrs old. Two of them (8.6%) married the first time at the age of 45. One man married the third time at the age of 45.5, and the widower remarried at the age of 65. Five of the couples (21.7%) are childless. The rest (78.2%) have fewer than 4 children, and 3 couples (13%) have only one child. The age of the oldest and the youngest child shows at which stage of raising children they are. Eight couples (34.7%) have teenagers, while 6 (26%) are still raising young children (age 5 and under).

### **Education**

Most have college level education. Among the women 15 (65.2%) have college education, 5 (21.7%) have post College level education, 3 (8.69%) have only high school education. Among the men 14 (60.8%) have college education, 8 (34.7%) have post college education and among them 1 has a doctorate. Only 1 (4.3%) of the men has not completed college (2 years of college). With 3 couples, the wife has post college education whereas the husband has college education. On the other hand, there were 2 couples where both husband and wife have post college education. With one couple the husband has post college education and his wife has high school education. With another couple the wife has completed college and the husband has two years of college.

### **Faith**

Twelve of the women (52.1%) did not commit themselves to the Evangelical faith until they were in their 20s and 30s, and the others when they were in their teens. Four wives (17.3%) have been Evangelicals for less than 10 yrs. (5 yrs, 6 yrs, 8 yrs and 8 yrs).

The men differ widely in the length of time of their affiliation with the Evangelical faith. Two (8.6%) were brought up as Evangelicals from birth. Five (21.7%) professed to be Evangelicals in their childhood (age 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9). Six (26%) became Evangelicals in their teen years (age 10 to 16), and 43.4% converted to the

Evangelical faith in their 20s and 30s. One of them became Evangelical at the age of 38 and another at the age of 40.

**Questionnaire 2 (The extend of church participation)**

**Q2**

<b>CODE</b>	<b>Sunday attendance</b>	<b>activities</b>	<b>joint church activities</b>	<b>CODE</b>	<b>Sunday attendance</b>	<b>activities</b>
<b>W1</b>	4	3	3	<b>H1</b>	4	3
<b>W2</b>	4	2	1	<b>H2</b>	3	1
<b>W3</b>	4	1	1	<b>H3</b>	4	2
<b>W4</b>	2	4	4	<b>H4</b>	2	4
<b>W5</b>	3	4	2	<b>H5</b>	4	3
<b>W6</b>	4	4	3	<b>H6</b>	4	4
<b>W7</b>	4	4	3	<b>H7</b>	4	5
<b>W8</b>	4	1	1	<b>H8</b>	2	2
<b>W9</b>	4	2	2	<b>H9</b>	4	2
<b>W10</b>	1	2	2	<b>H10</b>	1	3
<b>W11</b>	4	1	1	<b>H11</b>	3	1
<b>W12</b>	2	3	3	<b>H12</b>	4	4
<b>W13</b>	4	3	2	<b>H13</b>	4	2
<b>W14</b>	4	3	3	<b>H14</b>	4	3
<b>W15</b>	4	2	2	<b>H15</b>	4	3
<b>W16</b>	4	7	5	<b>H16</b>	4	7
<b>W17</b>	4	1	1	<b>H17</b>	4	1
<b>W18</b>	4	4	2	<b>H12</b>	4	4
<b>W19</b>	2	4	3	<b>H13</b>	4	5
<b>W20</b>	3	1	1	<b>H14</b>	3	1
<b>W21</b>	4	4	3	<b>H15</b>	4	3
<b>W22</b>	4	2	3	<b>H16</b>	4	2
<b>W23</b>	4	4	3	<b>H17</b>	4	6
<b>Avg. W</b>	3.5	2.9	2.4	<b>Avg. H</b>	3.6	3.1

"Sunday attendance" on table Q2 shows how many Sundays per month they regularly attend church. "Activities" indicate the different types of church activities they regularly participate in, and "joint church activities" are the activities in which the husband and wife regularly participate together. All of the spouses regularly attend the Sunday worship service of their church at least one Sunday per month. Seventeen wives (73.9%) and seventeen husbands (73.9%) attend church every Sunday. In addition they have other types of separate and joint church activities.

Eight of them do not have a perfect Sunday service attendance due to work schedule, other responsibility or ill health.

### Questionnaire 3 (The levels of marital commitment)

Note: When comparing the positive and negative statements, on the right side of the table, the reverse scores are 7 = 1, 6 = 2, 5 = 3, 3 = 5, 2 = 6, and 1 = 7. The items' list is presented on the next page. A positively phrased item is marked with "+", and "-" for the negative. "W" is the code for the wife, and "H" for the husband. One couple was eliminated due to the language barrier of one spouse (W8, H8).

Q3 CODE	Subscales		Items																SP		MD		CI		SS	
	Ded.	Con.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	1+6	9+13	2+10	7+14	3+15	5+11	4+16	8+12
W1	6.4	6.2	1	7	7	2	5	7	7	7	7	2	2	2	1	2	1	7	7	7	6.5	6.5	7	5.5	6.5	6.5
H1	5.9	5.5	1	7	7	1	5	7	7	7	7	1	7	1	1	1	1	6	7	7	7	7	7	3	6.5	7
W2	4.5	4.2	1	7	5	5	5	7	7	4	7	1	4	3	1	1	2	4	7	7	7	7	5.5	4.5	3.5	4.5
H2	6.1	5.8	1	6	7	2	7	7	5	6	7	3	2	4	2	3	1	6	7	6.5	5.5	5	7	6.5	6	5
W3	6.4	6.2	1	7	7	1	6	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	3	7	7	7	7	7	6.5	5	7	
H3	6.3	6.0	2	7	7	2	5	7	7	6	7	2	2	2	1	1	1	7	6.5	7	6.5	7	7	5.5	6.5	6
W4	7.0	7.0	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
H4	6.4	6.2	5	7	7	1	5	6	7	7	7	2	2	2	1	1	1	6	4.5	7	6.5	7	7	5.5	6.5	6.5
W5	7.0	7.0	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	3	1	1	1	2	1	7	7	7	6	6.5	7	7	7	7
H5	6.3	6.0	1	7	7	1	3	7	7	6	7	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	7	6
W6	7.0	7.0	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
H6	6.3	6.0	1	7	7	2	6	7	7	6	7	1	1	2	1	1	1	5	7	7	7	7	7	6.5	5.5	6
W7	7.0	7.0	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
H7	7.0	7.0	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
W8																										
H8																										
W9	7.0	7.0	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
H9	6.9	6.8	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	7	4	7	7	7	7	6.5	6.5
W10	6.5	6.3	1	7	7	1	6	7	7	6	7	3	2	1	1	3	1	6	7	7	6	6	7	6	6.5	6.5
H10	6.5	6.3	2	7	7	2	7	7	7	7	7	4	2	2	1	3	1	6	6.5	7	5.5	6	7	6.5	6	6.5
W11	5.9	5.5	2	7	7	3	7	6	6	5	6	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	6	6	6.5	6	7	7	4	5.5
H11	5.9	5.7	2	6	7	2	6	7	7	6	6	2	4	2	2	4	2	6	6.5	6	6	5.5	6.5	5	6	6
W12	6.6	6.5	1	7	7	2	7	7	7	6	7	1	2	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	6.5	6.5	6.5
H12	5.6	5.5	2	7	6	2	5	6	7	6	6	1	3	3	1	1	2	6	6	6.5	7	7	6	5	6	5.5
W13	6.6	6.5	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	6	7	1	1	2	1	1	1	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	6.5	6
H13	6.8	6.7	1	5	7	1	5	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	6	7	7	6	7	7
W14	3.1	2.8	1	7	7	7	2	7	7	1	6	5	6	2	1	3	7	5	7	6.5	5	6	4	2	3	3.5
H14	6.6	6.5	1	7	7	1	6	7	7	7	7	1	2	1	1	1	1	6	7	7	7	7	7	6	6.5	7
W15	6.9	6.8	1	7	7	1	6	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	6.5	7	7
H15	6.1	5.8	1	7	7	2	6	7	7	6	7	1	2	2	1	1	1	5	7	7	7	7	7	6	5.5	6
W16	6.0	6.0	1	7	5	2	6	7	7	6	7	2	1	2	1	1	1	5	7	7	6.5	7	6	6.5	5.5	6
H16	6.3	6.0	1	7	7	2	6	7	7	6	7	1	2	2	1	1	1	6	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	6
W17	5.8	5.3	1	7	7	4	5	7	7	6	7	2	1	4	1	3	1	6	7	7	6.5	6	7	6	5	5
H17	6.6	6.5	1	6	7	2	6	7	6	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	7	7	6.5	6.5	7	6.5	6	7
W18	6.8	6.7	1	7	7	1	6	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	7	7	7	7	7	6.5	6.5	7
H18	6.9	6.8	1	7	7	1	6	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	6.5	7	7
W19	6.3	6.0	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	7	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	4	7	7
H19	5.0	4.8	1	5	5	2	3	7	7	6	7	2	4	3	1	2	2	5	7	7	5.5	6.5	5.5	3.5	5.5	5.5
W20	6.8	6.8	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	2	1	1	2	2	7	7	7	7	6.5	6.5	6.5	7	7
H20	7.0	7.0	7	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	6	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	4	6	7	7	7	7	7	7
W21	5.9	5.5	1	7	7	4	4	7	7	7	7	2	1	1	1	1	1	4	7	7	6.5	7	7	5.5	4	7
H21	5.8	5.3	1	7	7	5	6	7	7	5	7	2	2	2	1	2	1	6	7	7	6.5	6.5	7	6	4.5	5.5
W22	6.8	6.7	1	7	7	1	6	7	7	7	7	1	2	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7
H22	6.5	6.3	1	4	7	1	6	7	7	7	7	1	2	2	1	1	1	6	7	7	5.5	7	7	6	6.5	6.5
W23	4.9	4.7	1	6	6	3	4	7	7	6	7	3	5	3	1	5	3	5	7	7	5.5	5	5.5	3.5	5	5.5
H23	5.8	5.3	1	6	7	2	4	7	6	6	7	2	4	2	1	2	1	6	7	7	6	6	7	4	6	6

Totals:

Q3	Subscales		Items																SP	MD	CI	SS				
	Ded.	Con.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16								
CODE			-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	1+6	9+13	2+10	7+14	3+15	5+11	4+16	8+12
M - W	6.2	6.1	1.0	7.0	6.8	2.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	6.2	6.9	1.7	2.0	1.5	1.0	1.6	1.5	5.9	13.9	13.9	13.3	13.3	13.3	11.9	11.9	12.7
M - H	6.3	6.1	1.6	6.5	6.9	1.7	5.6	6.9	6.8	6.5	6.6	1.5	2.2	1.9	1.1	1.5	1.1	6.2	13.0	13.2	12.8	13.1	13.5	11.3	12.3	12.4

- Item 1: Social Pressure (SP-)
- Item 2: Morality of Divorce (MD+)
- Item 3: Couple Identity (CI+)
- Item 4: Satisfaction with Sacrifice (SS-)
- Item 5: Couple Identity (CI+)
- Item 6: Social Pressure (SP+)
- Item 7: Morality of Divorce (MD+)
- Item 8: Satisfaction with Sacrifice (SS+)
- Item 9: Social Pressure (SP+)
- Item 10: Morality of Divorce (MD-)
- Item 11: Couple Identity (CI-)
- Item 12: Satisfaction with Sacrifice (SS-)
- Item 13: Social Pressure (SP-)
- Item 14: Morality of Divorce (MD-)
- Item 15: Couple Identity (CI-)
- Item 16: Satisfaction with Sacrifice (SS+)

The subscale of dedication consists of four items of CI and four of SS, and constraint consists of four items of MD and four items of SP. Each item has its reverse (-) counterpart.

The couple's results are placed one after another to facilitate easier comparison of the spouses' levels of commitment scores. The scores are based on a scale of 1 to 7. A value of 7 is the highest score for each statement. However, there are reverse statements which are scored by counting 7 as 1, etc. Stanley and Markman (1992) do not present a cut-off score for distress or non-distress level. The intention here is to

show that higher scores mean higher level and lower scores means lower level of commitment.

The mean of the wives for dedication is 6.2, and for constraint 6.1. The mean of the husbands for dedication is 6.3, and for constraint 6.1.

Dedication Commitment refers to the desire to maintain or to improve the quality of the spousal relationship for joint benefit. On the other hand, Constraint Commitment refers to internal or external forces that constraint the spouses to keep the marriage regardless the level of their personal dedication (Stanley and Markman 1992:596).

#### **Questionnaire 4 (The levels of marital adjustment)**

Note: One couple was eliminated due to the language barrier of one of the spouses.

The questions are grouped as follows:

##### Consensus

- Item 1: Religious matters (values)
- Item 2: Demonstration of affection (affection)
- Item 3: Making major decisions (dec. making)
- Item 4: Sex relations (affection)
- Item 5: Conventuality (values)
- Item 6: Career decisions (dec. making)

##### Satisfaction

- Item 7: How often do you discuss terminating your relationship? (stability)
- Item 8: How often do you and your partner quarrel? (conflict)
- Item 9: Do you ever regret that you married? (satisfaction)
- Item 10: How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves"? (conflict)

##### Cohesion

- Item 11: Do you and your mate engage in outside interest together? (activities)
- Item 12: How often do you have a stimulating exchange of ideas? (discussion)
- Item 13: How often do you work together on a project? (activities)
- Item 14: How often do you calmly discuss something? (discussion)

Table Q4

Q4 CODE	Subscales			Items													
	Cons.	Satisf.	Coh.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
W1	24	14	10	4	5	3	5	3	4	5	3	3	3	2	3	1	4
H1	23	14	10	5	4	4	4	2	4	5	2	4	3	2	3	1	4
W2	20	14	8	4	3	4	3	2	4	5	3	3	3	3	2	1	2
H2	18	14	7	3	3	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	3	2	2	2	1
W3	23	16	14	4	4	3	5	4	3	4	3	5	4	0	5	4	5
H3	20	16	9	4	4	3	4	2	3	5	3	5	3	2	2	3	2
W4	28	17	13	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	3	2	4	3	4
H4	29	18	12	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	2	4	2	4
W5	22	15	8	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	3	2	2	2	2
H5	24	15	11	3	4	4	5	3	5	4	3	5	3	2	3	2	4
W6	18	18	9	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	4	5	4	2	3	2	2
H6	24	17	10	4	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	3	2	3	1	4
W7	29	18	19	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	5
H7	24	19	19	5	4	5	5		5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5
W8																	
H8																	
W9	24	17	16	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	2	4	5	5
H9	22	17	11	4	3	3	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	2	1	4	4
W10	22	17	14	4	4	3	4	4	3	5	4	5	3	2	5	2	5
H10	23	17	11	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	2	3	3	3
W11	21	15	8	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	2	2
H11	23	12	10	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	2	3	1	4
W12	26	15	14	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4
H12	21	14	9	5	3	3	4	2	4	5	3	3	3	2	2	2	3
W13	28	18	14	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	5	1	5
H13	24	16	14	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	5	3	3	4	2	5
W14	18	7	10	4	3	3	2	4	2	3	1	2	1	2	2	1	5
H14	20	12	11	5	2	4	2	4	3	4	1	5	2	1	3	4	3
W15	22	18	11	5	3	3	4	3	4	5	4	5	4	2	3	1	5
H15	22	18	10	5	3	3	3	3	5	5	4	5	4	1	2	3	4
W16	21	10	14	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	4	5	3
H16	22	12	14	3	4	3	3	4	5	4	2	4	2	3	5	3	3
W17	22	10	6	5	2	4	4	3	4	3	2	4	1	2	1	1	2
H17	24	15	11	4	2	4	5	4	5	4	3	5	3	2	3	3	3
W18	21	16	6	4	3	3	3	3	5	5	3	5	3	2	1	1	2
H18	20	14	9	4	3	3	4	2	4	5	3	3	3	2	2	1	4
W19	29	16	14	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	3	5	3	3	5	1	5
H19	23	15	14	4	3	4	4	3	5	5	3	4	3	3	4	2	5
W20	24	15	14	4	4	4	4	3	5	4	3	5	3	2	3	4	5
H20	28	18	16	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	4	5	4
W21	21	13	14	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	2	3	5	1	5
H21	19	17	12	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	5	4	3	3	2	4
W22	27	18	14	5	5	5	4	3	5	5	4	5	4	3	3	3	5
H22	24	19	17	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	4	5
W23	26	16	12	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	5	3	3	4	1	4
H23	21	17	9	4	3	4	3	3	4	5	4	5	3	3	2	1	3

Mean for the wives and husbands:

Q4 CODE	Subscales			Items													
	Cons.	Satisf.	Coh.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>M - W</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>11.9</b>	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.6	4.0	4.4	3.3	4.4	3.0	2.3	3.4	2.3	3.9
<b>M - H</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>11.6</b>	4.1	3.5	3.7	4.0	3.2	4.2	4.6	3.3	4.5	3.2	2.3	3.1	2.5	3.7

Each wife's and her husband's scores are displayed one after the other for easier comparison, and the subscales scores are in the three left hand columns. The mean for the subscales for the wives are: 23.5 (consensus), 15.1 (satisfaction), and 11.9 (cohesion). The mean for the husbands' subscales are: 22.6 (consensus), 15.7 (satisfaction), and 11.6 (cohesion). This questionnaire does not intent to determine distress or non-distress marital condition, rather to display spouses' levels of adjustment. Higher scores indicate higher levels of adjustment, and lower scores, lower levels of adjustment.

Note:

In their study, Busby et al. 1995 report the mean of the levels of non-distress and distress as follows:

	<b>Non-distressed</b>		<b>Distressed</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Consensus	24.2	3.1	20.1	3.9	22.6	4.0
Satisfaction	15.7	2.2	12.2	3.1	14.3	3.1
Cohesion	12.4	2.8	9.3	3.3	11.1	3.4
Total	52.3	6.6	41.6	8.2	48.0	9.0

### 3.4.2 The results of the personal interviews

Item A. Connecting with Questionnaire 3 and 4 (Clarification of the participants' concerns on Q3 and Q4)

The question asked was: Which question/questions stood out because it was hard to answer, ambiguous, or you feel like expanding on your answer?

This question was a provision for the participants to voice their doubts, expand or comment on their answers to questionnaire 3 and 4.

The items most of them felt they needed to explain further were related to divorce and sacrificing for the partner in questionnaire 3: 7, 10, 14. These issues were brought up 13 times. Their opinion on this issue will be presented in section G. Position on Divorce and Sacrificial Love.

Another topic of interest seemed to be "conventionality" in questionnaire 4A: 5, which came up 9 times in this section. This issue will be included in their answer in I. Dealing with Differences.

Also, the question on "work together on a project" of questionnaire 4D: 13 received attention. Eight participants found it necessary to comment on it, because they felt that it was vague or ambiguous. Two said their work is naturally the kind that requires them to work together on a project daily anyway. The next two were dissatisfied with the statement saying that their work schedule would not allow time for working together on a project. Yet another two said that working together would cause problems between them, because of their differences in personality and opinion.

Three persons clarified that when they filled out questionnaire 4B: 8 (How often do you and your partner quarrel?), their quarrels were not serious. One man complained that questionnaire 3 and 4 did not leave room for talking about deeper and meaningful relationship. The rest either said that they simply did not have anything to add or to comment on, or would just like to clarify if they had correctly understood certain statements of questionnaire 3 or 4.

Overall, this section allowed them to air their concerns and feel listened to. It serves as a transition to the personal interview that immediately followed.

Item B. How They Met (The situation leading to marriage, and ties with their own and the spouse's country of origin).

I. The following list shows how the spouses met:

1. Fellow students: 2
2. Foreign teacher (he) - student (she) relationship: 1
3. Through the work place: 5
4. Through church activity: 4
- 5.1 Through an intermediary of a friend/relative for face-to-face introduction: 4
- 5.2 Through an intermediary of a friend/relative arranging pen-pal relationship: 2
6. Pen-pal club: 2
7. At a social event: 3

None of the women was a mail-order bride. Getting acquainted can be associated with propinquity through work (21.7%), through church (17.3%), or study (13%). Also, friends and relatives (26%), social events (13%), and a pen-pal club (8.6%) can serve as an avenue for meeting.

II. 1 Their continued ties with relatives in the homeland (16 couples living in North America)

1. Three couples (18.7%) have not returned to the Philippines. With 1 couple, the wife's reason was that she was not close to her family. Another couple said that they have lived as a couple in the Philippines for many years. Now her relatives visit them in North America instead of them going to the Philippines.
2. Another 2 couples (12.5%) have returned together as couple to the Philippines once or twice.
3. With yet 2 other couples (12.5%), the wives have returned to the Philippines once or twice, but unaccompanied by the husband. One of these women said that her husband does not visit for fear of having to buy gifts for all of her relatives.
4. Another 7 couples (43.7%) have returned as a couple to the Philippines often.
5. With 2 more couples (12.5%), her family has moved to North America.

II. 2 The couples that currently live in the Philippines (7)

All 7 couples visit North America often.

Thus, the majority of the spouses continue maintaining ties with their family in the homeland and with their in-laws. Among the women, one seems to discontinue relationship with her relatives because she did not feel close to them, but all visit their in-laws in North America often. All of the men could visit with their relatives in North America often, whereas 4 of them did not visit their in-laws in the Philippines.

Item C. Expectation for Choice of a Church (The church where they feel comfortable)

The 23 couples (16 living in North America, and 7 in the Philippines) mentioned the following criteria for choosing a church:

**Table C**

Numbers of wives	Numbers of husbands	Preference for a church
16 W (69.5%)	14 H (60%)	Filipino Church
1 W (4.3%)(for the sake of husband and children)	2 H (8.6%) (language and cultural barrier)	White North American church
23 W (100%)	23 H (100%)	Ethnic or non-ethnic church is not the real issue
5 W (21.7%)	2 H (8.6%)	Multiculture church
0 W	0 H	Large church
0 W	2 H (8.6%)	Medium church
7 W (30.4%)	7 H (30.4%)	Small church
11 W (47.8%)	14 H (60.8%)	Size of church does not really matter
8 W (34.7%)	10 H (43.4%)	Good fellowship and friendship
6 W (26%)	3 H (13%)	Opportunity to practice gifts
14 W (60.8%)	9 H (39.1%)	feeling belonging, rooted, like extended family
1 W (4.3%)	2 H (8.6%)	Where the spouse feels belonging and comfortable
2 W (8.6%)	4 H (17.3%)	Comfortable with the pastor
10 W (43.4%)	11 H (47.8%)	The church ministers to whole family, especially the kids
9 W (39.15%)	13 H (56.5%)	There is good Biblical teaching and practices, feeding for spiritual growth
1 W (4.3%)	1 H (4.3%)	There is disciplining and mentoring
1 W (4.3%)	0 H	Traditional church
1 W (4.3%)	0 H	Liberal church

Currently 7 couples are in the Philippines. Thus, they attend a Filipino church. Of the 16 couples that live in North America, 5 (31.5%) attend a Filipino church, and 4 (25%) attend a multicultural church, 7 (43.7%) attend a "White" church.

One couple that is now residing in North America, and 2 couples that are in the Philippines stated that, when they are in North America, they would attend a White, English speaking church, but when they are in the Philippines they would attend a Filipino church.

One couple living in North America is still member of a Filipino church, but they also attend a large "White" church. She likes the Filipino church, because it is like her extended family, and she can contribute with her spiritual gifts there. However, she feels that they are not spiritually nourished in the small Filipino church. The couple enjoys the teaching in a large "White" church. Now they are looking for a church where there can be a sense of extended family and practicing gifts, but also where there is good teaching.

In spite of the variety of preferences, all of the participants were quick to affirm that the choice of an ethnic or non-ethnic church is not really an issue. Also, for the majority, the size of the church was not really relevant, although several feel more comfortable in a small church.

The items that were mentioned often are: feeling belonging, rooted, like an extended family, good Biblical teaching and practices, spiritually fed for growth, a church that ministers to whole family, and good fellowship and friendship. Also, 6 wives mentioned practicing spiritual gifts.

Item D. The Contribution of their Church to the Well-being of their Marriage  
(The kind of church participation that has benefited the marriage)

List D

I. The results among the 16 couples living in North America

The wives answers can be grouped in three themes:

1. Five wives (31.2%) perceive that their church contributes to the well-being of their marriage by providing a sense of belonging and extended family.

1. 1 Help their children feel rooted. The church is their extended family.

1. 2 The pastor cares for them as a couple and as a family and the congregation is like a family.

1. 3 They know the pastors and leaders who can give them advice. They have friends in church. This is their extended family.

1. 4 They have supportive friends in church. It is their extended family. They feel belonging and accepted as a couple and as a family.

1. 5 The church is supportive and helpful to them as a couple and as a family. The congregation shows love in practical ways, and they are accommodating.

2. Another 5 wives (31.2%) report that the contribution of the church was through a Bible study group, or small group, and through the teaching they received.

2. 1 The women Bible study group helps them, through teaching, support, and accountability. It increases their understanding and gives counsel on marriage and family matters.

2. 2 In the small group they support one another.

2. 3 The teaching, praying for one another, supporting one another, modeling marriage life, and helping one another in dealing with problems are helpful, especially in the women's group.

2. 4 They have common friends in church in the Bible study. In this group there is encouragement, teaching on Christian living, friendship and accountability, but this is not referring to the church as a whole.

3. The third group is of 6 wives (37.5%). They express that their church did not contribute to the well-being of their marriage.

3. 1 They cannot attend the couples' group of their church because of her

husband's work schedule. The church provides counseling for those who have marital problems. Occasionally there is a series of sermon on marriage. She feels that the two last mentioned do not really apply to her marriage situation.

3. 2 Their church focuses more and more on "seekers". It has grown too big.
3. 3 One wife said that she did not get anything out of the church service. She does not have close friends in this church due to the language barrier.
3. 4 They have opportunity to serve in many ways, but the church does not minister to couples.
3. 5 The pastor is helpful and supportive, but the congregation does not contribute to the well-being of her marriage because of gossips and lack of trust.
3. 6 Her church does not contribute to the well-being of the marriage because it focuses too much on social and political issues. The Biblical teaching on marriage she knows, she learned from her family of origin.

The husband's view can be grouped in 7 themes:

1. Four of 16 husbands (25%) feel that the sense of extended family and support system they experience in their church contribute to the well-being of their marriage.
  1. 1 They know the pastor personally and the church's fellowship is like an extended family. As a couple they feel accepted, supported and accountable. Their children's needs are met through the children's ministry.
  1. 2 The church is their support system.
  1. 3 They have friends in church and this is their extended family. The preaching and teaching is based on the Word of God. Their whole family participates.
  1. 4 Their church is their family and support system. They feel belonging and comfortable.

2. Two other husbands (12.5%) believe that their church provides stability to their marriage through teaching and modeling.
  2. 1 They receive prayer support, and modeling for their life as a couple. They attend church activities that are good for their marriage, e.g. couples' retreat, family camp, men's retreat, and women's retreat.
  2. 2 There is teaching and modeling in the congregation and they feel comfortable there.
3. Another one (6.2%) expresses the benefit of being perceived as a unit.
  3. 1 In their church they are perceived as a couple, as a family unit. Friends outside the church tend to perceive them as separate individuals.
4. Two other husbands (12.5%) say that they benefited from feeling accepted and belonging in their church
  4. 1 One man says that in their church they feel accepted and belonging as a couple. Also, the wife's having ministry opportunities there help them feel belonging.
  4. 2 The other says that the church makes them feel accepted and comfortable. Note that to the contrary, the wife of this man felt that their church did not contribute to their marriage because it is focused on social and political issues (see 3. 6, wives' section).
5. Three others (18.7%) considered shared activities and friends in church as contributing to the well-being of their marriage.
  5. 1 Their circle of friends and shared activities revolved around their church. This strengthened the marriage.
  5. 2 They share common interests and activities as a couple in the church. This strengthened their marriage.
  5. 3 They share their life together in the congregation. The church community strengthened their relationship as a couple.
6. Two others (12.5%) felt that the church contributed to the well-being of their marriage, because it is where they feel comfortable.
  6. 1 One man said that his whole family and friends are in this church. This is where he grew up. They were married here. The pastor gave them

premarital counseling and officiated their wedding. The church supports and involves them in their activities as a couple. Note that to the contrary, his wife said that the church did not contribute to the well-being of their marriage. She does not get anything out of the service, and she has no close friends there due to the language barrier (see 3. 3, wives' section).

6. 2 Another man believes that having some trusted friends in the church is helpful for the marriage. Their church friends are supportive, encouraging and can give his wife good advice. Note that to the contrary, his wife says that their church did not contribute to the well-being of their marriage, because there are gossips and there is lack of trust (see 3. 5, wives' section).

7. Two others (12.5%) do not feel that the church contributes to the well-being of their marriage.

7. 1 Their church is a "seeker friendly" church and it has become too big to meet marriage and family needs. His opinion corresponds to his wife's (see 3. 2, wives' section).

7. 2 They just minister in their church. There is neither positive nor negative influence on their marriage relationship. His wife also did not see benefit from the church for their marriage (see 3. 4, wives' section).

II. The responds of the seven couples that reside in the Philippines

1. Two wives (28.5%) underline the benefits from Bible study or small group meetings and the teaching they have received.

1. 1 She would have given up the marriage if she had not received Biblical teaching in her church. It teaches her to obey God. There are also role-models in the church that she did not have from her background. Also, the church community holds them accountable as a couple.

1. 2 The Bible study teaches to sacrifice and to serve one another. Before she used to think that marriage relationship is 50 - 50. If people are unhappy in marriage, they divorce. Now that she has learned to submit to her

husband, she feels more relaxed.

2. Another two (28.5%) perceive that ministering together as a couple and as family strengthens their marriage.

2. 1 They are involved together as a family. They share the joys and struggles in ministering to others. They have a common bond and focus. However, they need to set aside private family time that they lack (Church planter's family).

2. 2 She and her husband teach a Bible study group together. They practice their spiritual gifts and share common friends.

3. Another one (14.2%) stresses the sense of extended family and the Bible study as strengthening the marriage.

3. 1 In the church they experience acceptance, encouragement, and a sense of extended family. The Bible study strengthens her Biblical conviction on marriage and provides accountability.

4. Yet another one (14.2%) clarifies that it is not so much direct teaching from the Bible that contributes to their marriage well-being. Rather, it is the fellowship, where the Biblical principles are practiced. They are reminded to stay committed in marriage. There is accountability, support and modeling in the fellowship.

5. Only one (14.2%) does not receive benefits from their church for the well-being of their marriage.

5. 1 Their work schedule does not allow them time for church involvement. They do not have close friends in their church.

The results of their husbands' responds are the following:

1. For two husbands (28.5%) their church strengthens their marriage through common Biblical teaching and faith, and through the role model they experience as a couple and as a family.

1. 1 The Biblical teaching, the role-models in more mature couples, and the couples' group help them grow closer as a couple.

1. 2 The church deepens their common faith. Many couples in church can serve as role models for them. They build up one another in church.

They receive the same teaching as a couple, and even their children receive instruction.

2. One man (14.2%) says that their church strengthens their marriage through family ties and church involvement.

2. 1 In their church they feel accepted and comfortable as a couple. Her family also attends there. They enjoy Sundays with the family. The church is like their extended family. Their long-term commitment and involvement in the church strengthens their marriage.

3. Two others (28.5%) believe that ministering together and maintaining accountability with several other couples benefit their marriage.

3. 1 They can minister together as a couple in the church, and they maintain accountability with several other couples. Their marriage is strengthened because they jointly teach a Bible study. They are serving together.

4. However, one other husband (14.2%) admits that being involved together can be both good and bad for the marriage.

4. 1 They are involved in ministry as a whole family. This strengthens their family bond. However, they are always on the giving end. They always have to serve as a role model to the rest of the congregation. They themselves do not receive spiritual nourishment for their marriage. (He is a pastor and church planter. See also his wife's comment in 2. 1, wives in the Philippines).

5. Lastly, one (14.2%) does not experience benefits from their church for the well-being of their marriage.

5. 1 He has difficulty mixing with people he does not know. He does not feel spiritually fed in this church. He does not experience good fellowship there (see also his wife's comment in 5. 1).

Overall, for 62.5% of the wives living in North America, their church contributes to the well-being of their marriage, but for 37.5% it does not. On the other hand, 87% of the husbands experience benefit for the marriage, and 12.5% do not.

Of the 7 couples living in the Philippines 6 (85.7%) experience benefits from their church for the well-being of their marriage, but one couple (14.2%) does not. One other couple feels that they are benefiting by ministering together as a family in church planting, but they did not experience benefits for their marriage. They are always on the giving end.

In general, the wives who live in North America as well as those who are in the Philippines report the following experiences in their church as beneficial for the well-being of their marriage: the feeling of belonging and being accepted, involvement in church, shared participation and common friendship. Through their Bible study, small group, or women's group, they receive teaching for the whole family, role modeling, support and accountability.

Overall, the husbands report the following experiences in their church as contributive to the well-being of their marriage: the feeling of belonging to the family and support system, feeling accepted as a couple, having common friendships, receiving the same Biblical teaching as a couple and family, experiencing modeling, experiencing accountability, and shared involvement.

Item E. Relationship with In-laws (Religious backgrounds of the family of origin, and intercultural adjustment to in-laws)

#### I. Religious background

Although all couples in the sample are Evangelicals, there is a wide variety in religious adherence of their family of origin. Several configurations are:

1. Both sides of the family are Evangelicals: 6 couples
2. Both sides of the family are not Evangelicals: 4 couples
3. Her family is Evangelical, and his are Roman Catholics: 1 couple
4. His family is Evangelical, and hers is Roman Catholic: 1 couple

5. One side of the family is Roman Catholic and the other nominal Evangelical: 3 couples.
6. One of the mothers of the couple is Evangelical: 2 couples
7. One side of the family is Evangelical; on the other side only the mother is Evangelical: 2 couples
8. His mother is an Evangelical, and his father an agnostic; her family is very conservative Evangelical: 1 couple
9. Her father is an Evangelical, her mother is a Roman Catholic, and his parents are Evangelicals: 1 couple
10. Her father is a nominal Evangelical; her mother is a nominal Buddhist, her siblings are Evangelicals: 1 couple

Thus, with 6 couples of the 23 (26%), both partners have Evangelical family of origin. With 7 couples (30%) only the mother of either the husband or of the wife is Evangelical. On the other hand, with one couple only her father (4.3%) is Evangelical, and her mother is Roman Catholic. The other 10 (43.4%) couples have other different kinds of religious configuration in their families of origin.

## II. 1 Feeling accepted by the in-laws (16 couples that reside in North America)

1. Both the husband and the wife feel accepted in the spouses' family (10 couples).
2. The wife feels accepted by the in-laws from the beginning, but at first the husband did not feel accepted by his father-in-law, because he was a Caucasian. Later he feels accepted (1 couple).
3. At the beginning the wife did not feel accepted by her mother-in-law, because the mother-in-law had a bad experience of living in the Philippines in the past. Her father-in-law was at first against the marriage because her father required her husband to convert to Roman Catholicism in order to marry her. The in-laws accept her now that she is the mother of their grandchildren. The in-laws love the grandchildren. Also, the husband did not immediately feel accepted by his father-in-law. His father-in-law required him to convert to Roman Catholicism before marrying his wife (1 couple).

4. The wife feels respected by the mother-in-law because of her good educational background, but her relationship with the in-laws is cold. The husband feels accepted in his wife's family, but his wife wants to live far away from her extended family for fear of their financial dependence (1 couple).
5. The wife feels that the mother-in-law accepted her from the beginning. She did not feel the father-in-law accepted her initially, but he later did. The husband feels rejected by her family because they expected her to marry a man with higher qualification. His relationship with his in-laws is cold (1 couple).
6. She feels accepted but her relationship with her in-laws is not close. He feels accepted in her family (1 couple).
7. She feels accepted by his family from the beginning. He feels that his father-in-law has nothing against him personally but that he is a nationalist and he had a bad experience with some Americans in the Philippines. He feels that he can get along with his in-laws but he does not feel close (1 couple).

Thus, most couples (62.5%) feel accepted by in-laws on both sides. One couple did not feel accepted by their in-law immediately. One wife felt accepted immediately but the husband did not feel accepted in the beginning. With 2 couples, the wives' relationship with their in-laws is cold, whereas the husbands feel accepted. However, with one other couple the wife feels accepted but the husband's relationship with the in-laws is cold.

The reasons for not feeling accepted varied. Only one was due to prejudice of racial and cultural difference. Other reasons were because of marrying out of the Roman Catholic faith, difference in personality, the in-laws' personal experience that led to initial prejudice of the relationship, or the family was not closely knit to begin with. Overall, there has been a progress toward acceptance by the in-laws, especially because of the in-laws' love for the grandchildren.

## II. 2 Couples that reside in the Philippines (7):

1. The wife feels accepted from the beginning. At first, the husband did not feel accepted. His in-laws were against their marriage, because they thought the couple were too young to marry. His in-laws are satisfied with their marriage now. They love their grand-children (1 couple).
2. She feels accepted in his family. He feels accepted in her family but his relationship to them is cold. His mother-in-law is controlling (1 couple).
3. She feels accepted. He feels accepted and close to the in-laws, especially his father-in-law, because they share the same interests (1 couple).
4. She feel accepted in his family. He feels accepted in her family but his relationship to them is cold, because of the language barrier (1 couple).
5. She feels accepted by her in-laws, and he feels accepted in her family (1 couple).
6. She does not feel accepted at first. Her mother-in-law was apprehensive of the marriage, because she suspected her of using the marriage as a passage to North America. Her mother-in-law's attitude changed after knowing her. He feels accepted by his in-laws but does not feel close to them. His in-laws were not pleased with his wife conversion to the Evangelical faith, but later they accepted it (1 couple).
7. She feels accepted by her in-laws. He feels accepted in her family but does not feel close to them, due to language and cultural barriers (1 couple).

Among the 7 couples that live in the Philippines, 2 couples (28.5%) feel accepted and have a good relationship with in-laws on both sides. With one other couple, she feels accepted by her in-laws but he did not feel accepted at the beginning, and with another one she did not feel accepted at the beginning, and her husband does not feel close to her relatives. In fact, with 4 couples (57.1%), the husbands do not have a close relationship to their in-laws, although only one felt apprehension from his in-law initially. To the contrary 6 wives (85.7%) say that they feel accepted in their husband's family from the beginning.

The reasons given for the lack of warmth in the relationship vary from the personality of the in-laws, language and cultural barriers, religion, and the fact that the family is not closely knit. In the case of one husband, the father-in-law was initially reluctant to accept him, because he was a Caucasian. Also, one wife initially felt that her mother-in-law suspected that she married her son to get a passage to North America, but in both cases the prejudice was corrected after they got to know one another.

### III. 1 Intrusion by the in-laws (The 16 couples that live in North America)

1. 1 Both spouses of 14 couples (87.5%) do not feel that the in-laws intrude in their marriage life. In some cases, financial support for the wives' relatives could have been an issue. However, one wife said that her husband is generous and does not mind giving financial support to her extended family. With another couple in this group, both the husband and the wife did not consider supporting her relatives financially as a burden. The husband of one other couple of the 14 said that his wife takes precaution against financial dependence of her relatives by living far away from them.
  1. 1. 2 Two couples of the fourteen consciously prevent in-laws intrusion by maintaining a united front (Gen :2:24).
  1. 1. 3 With one other couple among the 14, the wife said that at first her in-laws intruded in matters of child discipline, but her husband took her side maintaining priority of loyalty to the spouse over that to the parent according to Gen 2:24. The children are grown up now and the in-laws no longer intrude.
2. 1 With one couple of the 16, the husband felt that his in-laws intruded by financially depending on them. On the other hand, his wife does not feel any intrusion from any in-laws.
2. 2 With one other couple of the 16, the wife mentioned that the husband often complained about the issue of financial support for her relatives, whereas she thought that she should support her extended family because they are needy.

Overall, the majority of those living in North America do not perceive intrusion from in-laws in their marriage and family affairs. Maintaining a united front between husband and wife was mentioned in dealing with in-laws' intrusion. Only in one case there was a period of intrusion by an in-law in matters of child discipline. In the other cases issues of financial support for the wife's relatives were felt as intrusions. Although two couples did not consider financially supporting the wife's relatives as an intrusion or a burden, because they perceive it as generosity. One wife mentioned financial support for her relatives as helping the needy.

### III. 2 Couples that live in the Philippines (7):

1. Both spouses of five couples (71.4%) do not experience intrusion from their in-laws. One wife among the five explained that her in-laws give advice but do not insist; she did not consider it as intrusion. Another wife added that both sides of the family live far away, therefore there is no intrusion.
2. With one couple, the wife did not feel any intrusion from her in-laws, but the husband sensed intrusion from his in-laws. He said that his mother-in-law is controlling. She dominates the household when she visits. Also, her relatives expect financial support and jobs from them. Now that they have moved away from the relatives, these people do not bother them as much, but the relationship to them is now cold.
3. With one couple, both spouses feel intrusion of their in-laws. The wife said that her mother-in-law can be controlling and intruding. Therefore, they only make short visits to his family in North America. They would stay not more than two weeks at a time. She and her husband maintain a united front when dealing with the in-laws on both sides (Gen.2: 24). Also, her husband feels challenged in dealing with the expectation of his wife's extended family for financial support. Although he feels accepted by her family and extended family, he finds that the relatives often crossed a financial boundary.

Overall, 71.4% of the couples that live in the Philippines do not sense intrusions from their in-laws. In the cases where there were intrusions from the in-laws, the couple maintained a united front, or moved away from the in-laws. For the women a controlling mother-in-law seems to be the frequent intrusion. Although one man also mentioned a controlling mother-in-law, two of the seven men (28.5%) perceived the in-laws' expectation for financial support as a challenge in their marriage. The wife of one of the two men agreed with the husband concerning the financial burden of the extended family, whereas the wife of the other one did not mention the problem.

Item F. Leadership in their Home (The functioning of gender - role in the intercultural couples' home)

The participants answered the questions: 1. Who is the leader in the home?  
 2.1. Who disciplines the children? 2.2. Who decides on children's education?  
 3. Who manages the money in the home?

The aspects of the role functioning can be based for instance on: Biblical teaching (Bt), common sense (Cs), parental modeling (Pm), culture (Cu), or Personality (Pr).

Note: The basis for the role-functioning style is reported as expressed by the participants.

Couples that reside in North America (16)

**Table F 1**

W1	1. She is working on making him leader, because of Biblical teaching. He does not have the personality. Also her mother was leader in her home. 2.1 The discipline of children is joint responsibility. 2.2 Joint decision on child's education. 3. He manages the money. She is not comfortable with electronic banking.	Bt  Cs  Cs  Cs	H1	1. Biblically, he knows that he is to be the leader, but she is more a leader type. He does not mind. His mother was the leader too. 2.1 The discipline of children is joint responsibility. 2.2 He has the last word because of his experience in education. 3. He manages the money. She is uncomfortable with electronic banking.	Pr + Pm  Cs  Cs  Cs
----	--	----------------------------------	----	---	---------------------------------------

W2	<p>1. She has a lot of say in the home. Her mother was the same</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of child is joint task.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education (Cs)</p> <p>3. She manages the money. She is afraid he will spend too much if he does it.</p>	<p>Pm</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H2	<p>1. Equality is his Biblical view: "helpmate".</p> <p>2.1 Children's discipline is joint task.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education.</p> <p>3. She manages money. She wants to have control over it. It seems common among Filipino wives. He accepted it. He thinks she does a good job.</p>	<p>Bt</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cu + Cs</p>
W3	<p>1. She is leader</p> <p>2.2 Disciplining children is joint task.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education.</p> <p>3. She manages money. She is more organized.</p>	<p>Pr +Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H3	<p>1. She is leader. He is it on the surface. It is also so with his Dad.</p> <p>2.1 Disciplining children is joint task.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education. (Cs)</p> <p>3. She manages money. In the Philippines the woman administers the finances. She is good at that.</p>	<p>Pr +</p> <p>Pm</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cu + Cs</p>
W4	<p>1. He is the leader. It's Biblical. Her father is leader too.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education. They keep a united front.</p> <p>3. He manages money, his training as accountant.</p>	<p>Bt +</p> <p>Pm</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H4	<p>1. He is leader. It's Biblical. His father is leader.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task.</p> <p>2.2. Joint decision on child's education.</p> <p>3. He manages money. He is an accountant</p>	<p>Bt +</p> <p>Pm</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>
W5	<p>1. Different domains of leadership. He is the spiritual leader. This is Biblical. Her responsibility is around the home. He brings the paycheck. He makes the major decisions, but consults her. This is just commonsense.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is a joint task, but he does the serious disciplining. She warns: "Wait till your Dad comes home".</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education, but he has the last say.</p>	<p>Bt +</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cu</p> <p>Cs +</p> <p>Cu</p> <p>+Pr</p>	H5	<p>1. Different domains. He is the spiritual leader. She manages the home because he is away a lot.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task. She is more vocal. He is stricter.</p> <p>2.2 Different domains of decision. His domain is on the larger issues.</p> <p>3. Different domains. She manages money by mutual agreement. He manages finances on bigger projects.</p>	<p>Cs</p> <p>Cu</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>

	3. Different domains. She manages day-to-day transactions; they make major decisions jointly.	Cs			
W6	1. Joint leadership. He compromises a lot. It's personality. 2.1 He disciplines the children. 2.2 She makes decision on child's education because of her gift and training. 3. He manages the money. He is more gifted in it.	Pr  Cs Cs Cs	H6	1. He is the spiritual leader but they make joint decisions. 2.1 He disciplines the children. He is stricter. 2.2 He thinks they do it jointly. 3. He manages the money because of gift and training.	Bt Cs Cs Cs
W7	1. He is the leader but he always talks things over with her. This was also the case in her home. May be it's Filipino culture, but it is also Biblical. 2.1 Discipline of the child is joint task. It's culture. 2.2 They mutually agree on educational matters. 3. He manages the money, but they discuss it together. A matter of interest and gift.	Cu + Pm + Bt  Cu Cs Cs	H7	1. Different domains of leadership. He is the spiritual leader. She is leader on health and food issues. 2.1 Jointly. She disciplines by talking, he executes punishment. 2.2 Joint decision on child education. 3. Different domains. She "carries the purse" but they make joint decisions. They have different responsibilities because of gifts and interests.	Bt + Cs  Cs + Pr Cs Cs
W8	1. He is the leader. In the Philippines the father is the leader in the family. 2.1 Discipline of children is joint task. 2.2 They make joint decision on child's education. 3. He manages the money due to electronic banking. She manages her own money.	Cu  Cs Cs	H8	1. They have joint leadership. This is patterned after his own family. 2.1 He disciplines the children. He is more disciplinarian than his wife. 2.2 They make joint decisions of child's education. 3. He does the banking because it is electronic and she has language problem. She manages her own account.	Pm  Cs/Pr Cs Cs
W9	1. He is the leader. It's Biblical. 2.1 Disciplining the children is joint task. They agree on the principles. Whoever is home imposes it. 2.2 Joint decision on child's education.	Bt Cs Cs	H9	1. He is the leader. It is Biblical, but a leader is not a dictator; a servant leader sacrifices. 2.1 They work as a team in raising and disciplining the children. It's joint. 2.2 Joint decision on child's	Bt  Cs

	3. He manages the money. She is uncomfortable with electronic banking.	Cs		education. 3. He manages the money. She is uncomfortable with hi-tech banking.	Cs Cs
W10	1. He is the leader. She talks a lot, but he makes the decisions. 2.1 Discipline of child is joint task. Whoever is at home imposes it. 2.2 Joint decision on child's education. 3. He brings the paycheck home; she gives him what he needs. She manages the money. She has always managed money before and she likes doing it.	Cs Cs Cs Cs	H10	1. Different domains of leadership according gifts. 2.1 Disciplining the child is joint task. 2.2 Joint decision on child's education. 3. She manages the money. They do the budgeting together.	Cs Cs Cs Cs
W11	1. Now she is working on making him the leader. Husbands are to be head of the home This is Biblical teaching. She used to be the leader because her mother was the leader in her family. 2.1 She disciplines the children. She is stricter. 2.2 She made the decisions on child's education when they were small. 3. He manages the money. It is his gift.	Bt Pr + Cs Cs Cs	H11	1. He thinks he is the leader because his wife wants this and because of common sense. 2.1 His wife disciplines the children. They have different approaches on this. His wife believes in spanking. He believes in sending them to their room. 2.2 They make joint decisions on child's education. 3. He manages the money. She is too busy with her job and she thinks he does a good job.	Cs Cs + Pr Cs Cs
W12	1. She would like to think that he is the leader. She tends to be the strong one. Her mother was also like that. Most Filipino families are matriarchal. 2.1 No children 2.2 No children 3. They put the money in the same pot and manage it jointly.	Pm + Pr + Cu Cs	H12	1. Joint leadership. He believes that this is based on Biblical teaching. 2.1 No children 2.2 No children 3. They manage the money jointly. It is a matter of who has the gift.	Bt Cs
W19	1. He is the leader but he always asks her opinion. Her father was leader in her family too. It's parental modeling. 2.1 No children	Pm	H19	1. He is the leader based on Biblical teaching, modeling in his home and personality. 2.1 No children	Bt + Pm + Pr

	2.2 No children 3. Different domains. He deals with mortgage and investments, she with day-to-day expenses.	Cs		2.2No children 3. Different domains. He manages the bigger picture, she with the day-to-day. She manages her own earnings.	Cs
W20	1. Different domains. Hers is financial and the kitchen. His is the mechanical and the laundry. 2.1 No children 2.2 No children 3. She manages the money, because of her training and profession.	Cs  Cs	H20	1. He is the leader because of personality and Biblical teaching. 2.1 No children 2.2 No children 3. She manages money. She is an accountant by training and job.	PR + Bt  Cs
W12	1. He is the leader, based on Biblical teaching. The husband is the head of the home. 2.1 No children 2.2 No children 3. Different domains. She does the bookkeeping; he makes the decisions. It's different gifts.	Bt  Cs	H21	1. He is mostly the leader based on Biblical teaching and parental model. 2.1 No children 2.2 No children 3. Different domains. He is the boss, she the secretary. She pays bills, writes checks etc. He gives direction.	Bt + Pr  Cs
W23	1. Joint leadership. No one is lording over the other. It comes naturally. 2.1 Discipline of child is joint task. 2.2 Joint decision on child's education. 3. They both manage the money. They both work.	Bt + Pr Cs Cs Cs	H23	1. Joint leadership based on Biblical teaching and common sense. The Bible teaches that male and female are equal (Gal 3:28). It's commonsense because they both have something to contribute. 2.1 Discipline of child is joint task. 2.2 Joint decision on child's education. 3 Both equally manage money. They both work. No difference of male or female.	Bt + Cs  Cs Cs Bt + Cs

Couples that reside in the Philippines (7)

**Table F 2**

W13	<p>1. He is the leader. It's Biblical teaching, e.g. 1 Pe. 3, and somewhere in Colossians. She used to think it was 50 - 50, now she submits to her husband.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of the children is joint task.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education.</p> <p>3. She manages the banking. It's natural inclination. It's commonsense.</p>	<p>Bt</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H13	<p>1. He is the leader, based on Biblical teaching. But leadership is not lording. It means serving. This is Biblical.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task. It's Biblical.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education. It has to do with loving the spouse. Biblical.</p> <p>3. She does the books and banking. She makes the budget; he approves it. It's her gift. She feels secure if she knows the in-and-outs of money. It's commonsense.</p>	<p>Bt</p> <p>Bt</p> <p>Bt</p> <p>Cs</p>
W14	<p>1. He is the leader. It is Biblical. Her mother was the leader. Her culture is matriarchal.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task. Whoever sees the problem deals with it. Though he is the highest authority, they maintain a united front.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education.</p> <p>3. She manages the money. She is the principal breadwinner. She wishes she was not, and could concentrate on caring for the children.</p>	<p>Bt</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H14	<p>1. He is the leader. It's the Biblical concept of hierarchical role of father on top, then mother, and the children at the bottom.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education.</p> <p>3. She manages the money. She does a better job.</p>	<p>Bt</p> <p>Cs + Pr</p> <p>Cs + Pr</p> <p>Cs + Pr</p>
W15	<p>1. He is the leader. It is both Biblical and parental modeling.</p> <p>2.1 Children's discipline is joint task. It's Biblical.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decisions on child's education.</p> <p>3. She manages the money. She is an accountant.</p>	<p>Bt + Pm</p> <p>Bt</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H15	<p>1. He is the leader, based on both Biblical teaching and parental modeling.</p> <p>2.1 He mostly disciplines the children. It's both Biblical teaching and parental modeling.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education.</p> <p>3. She manages the money. Her gift and training.</p>	<p>Bt + Pm</p> <p>Bt + Pm</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>

W16	<p>1. He is the leader. It is based on Biblical teaching, not parental modeling. Her Mom was the boss; her Dad only brought the paycheck. Filipino culture is matriarchal.</p> <p>2.1 When he is around, he disciplines the children. When he is not around, she does it. He is more respected.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decisions on child's education.</p> <p>3. He manages the money. He does it better. This prevents her relative from asking for more financial help.</p>	<p>Bt</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H16	<p>1. He is leader, based on Biblical teaching (Eph. 5), and modeling of his parents.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decisions on child's education.</p> <p>3. He manages the money. It's his strength.</p>	<p>Bt + Pm</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>
W17	<p>1. He is the leader, but he always asks her opinion before making decisions. This is based on the marriage vow to consider one another.</p> <p>2.1 Most of the time he disciplines the children. When he is not around she does it.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decision on child's education.</p> <p>3. He manages the money. He is good at it.</p>	<p>Bt</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H17	<p>1. He is the leader in most things. It is Biblical teaching and personality.</p> <p>2.1 He disciplines the children.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decisions on child's education.</p> <p>3. Different domains. He pays the bill, and does banking. She does the day-to-day money management, e.g. grocery, pay maids etc.</p>	<p>Bt + Pr</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>
W18	<p>1. He is the leader. This is based on Biblical teaching and parental modeling.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task. They maintain a united front.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decisions on child's education.</p> <p>3. Different domains. He manages investment, or retirement plan. She manages the day-to-day finances.</p>	<p>Bt + Pm</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>	H 18	<p>1. He is the leader. It's based on Biblical teaching and parental modeling.</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task, but he is stricter. Biblical and commonsense.</p> <p>2.2 Joint decisions on child's education.</p> <p>3. Different domains. She does the accounting; it's her training. He takes care of savings and investment.</p>	<p>Bt + Pm</p> <p>Bt + Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>
W22	<p>1. He is the leader based on Biblical teaching and parental modeling.</p>	<p>Bt + Pm</p> <p>Cs</p>	H22	<p>1. Different domains of leadership. She is in charge of matters of cooking, raising and educating children. He is in charge of finances, ministry, decisions on</p>	<p>Bt</p>

<p>2.1 Different level of authority. She has more time with the kids. She disciplines as needed. He is the "supreme court".</p> <p>2.2 Joint decisions on child's education.</p> <p>3. He manages the money. He is the leader and he has the gift and training.</p>	<p>Cs</p> <p>Bt + Cs</p>	<p>housing etc. It's Biblical (Prov. 31).</p> <p>2.1 Discipline of children is joint task, but she has more time with them. She does more.</p> <p>2.2 She makes decisions of child's education. It is her domain.</p> <p>3. He manages the money. His gift and training.</p>	<p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p> <p>Cs</p>
---	--------------------------	--	-------------------------------

According to this table, most husbands are the overall leader in the home. However, there is a variety of role distribution and functioning as well, and there are different configurations of perspectives for the way they exercise their roles. Added to that, the husband and the wife may present a different point of view concerning the functioning and the bases for the gender role distribution in their home. Although Biblical teaching is mentioned in most aspects of the leadership, common sense, parental modeling, personality, and culture are also acknowledged as influential bases for role functioning.

Among the 16 couples that live in North America, 6 wives (37.5%) perceive their husbands as the leader in their home; 3 (18.7%) feel that they are the leader, 2 (12.5%) maintain that they practice different domains of leadership; 3 (18.7%) believe that they have joint leadership; and 2 (12.5%) are in the process of making their husbands the leader. Five of the husbands (31.2%) perceive themselves as the leader; 2 (12.5%) maintain that their wives are the leader; 3 (18.7%) believe that they practice different domains of leadership; 5 (31.2%) report that they have joint leadership, while 1 (6.2%) is still in the process of taking leadership.

Of the 7 couples that currently live in the Philippines, 6 wives (85.7%) maintain that their husbands are the leader, and 1 (14.2%) believes that they have joint leadership. Among their husbands 6 (85.7%) believe that they are the leader, and 1 (14.2%) feels that they have different domains of leadership.

Item G. Position on divorce and sacrificial love (The view on the permanence of marital commitment, and the teaching of sacrificial love)

I. Position on divorce and remarriage

Table G 1 is the respond to question: “What is your position on divorce?” It includes the case of abandonment, abuse, adultery, and remarriage after divorce. The participants can indicate the basis for their position for instance, as Biblical teaching (Bt), parental modeling (Pm), common sense (Cs), culture (Cu), and so forth.

Note: 1) Abandonment, 2) abuse, 3) adultery, 4) remarriage after divorce.

Couples 1 - 12, 19, 20, and 23 are living in North America. Couples 13 - 18, and 22 live in the Philippines.

**Table G 1**

Cd	Permitted	Base	Not permitted	Base	Not sure
W1	1. Permitted 2. It's permitted for safety 3. Permitted	Bt + Cs	Divorce is anti-biblical. 4. It would be adultery.	Bt	
H1			Absolutely no divorce. 1 They must wait for reconciliation. 2. Temporary separation. 3. They must seek help. 4. Remarriage only after the spouse has died.	Bt	
W2	1. First seek reconciliation 2. There must be temporary separation for safety and treatment first. 3. First seek help as much as possible	Bt + Cs	Divorce is against the Bible	Bt	4. Not sure about what the Bible says.
H2	1. Case by case consideration, but the couple must seek to reconcile first.	Bt + Cs			

	<p>2. The Bible does not allow violence on the weaker person.</p> <p>3. No absolute rule, but the couple must seek help first.</p> <p>4. Permitted depending on case-by-case situation.</p>				
W3			<p>Marriage is permanent in the Bible</p> <p>1. Not permitted</p> <p>2. No reason for divorce, but temporary separation for safety</p> <p>3. Not permitted (Bible and Filipino culture)</p> <p>4. Not permitted.</p>	<p>Bt</p> <p>+ Cs</p> <p>+ Cu</p>	
H3	<p>1. Permitted, if there is no repentance of the guilty. Forgiveness and reconciliation must be sought first. Jesus teaches forgiveness.</p> <p>2. Safety of the victim and the children must be considered first. If there is no repentance of the offender, divorce is permissible.</p> <p>3. Permitted</p> <p>4. Permissible for the victim.</p>	Bt + Cs			
W4			No to divorce.	Pm	<p>1. Not sure if permitted in the Bible</p> <p>2. Not sure what is stated in the Bible</p> <p>3. Not sure if it is permitted.</p> <p>4. Not sure what the Bible says about it.</p>
H4			<p>Marriage vow is until death</p> <p>1. No for divorce.</p>	Bt	

			2. Separation for safety, but no divorce. 3. No reason for divorce. Get help. 4. Remarriage only after the spouse is dead.		
W5	1. Yes, if the one who abandons already has another partner 3. Permitted	Bt	2. Temporary separation, and find cure	Cs	Divorce is not permitted, but she sees reality. On the other hand divorce has become too easy. 4. She needs to give more thought.
H5			Marriage is once in lifetime. 1. Even if reconciliation is not possible, no reason for divorce. 2. Separation for safety and treatment, not divorce. 3. Marriage difficulties must be worked out. 4. Remarriage is permissible after the spouse has died.	Bt	
W6	1. Yes, after seeking reconciliation first. 3. Permitted	Bt	2. No reason for divorce, but separation for protection, and to facilitate change. 4. Unless, the spouse died.	Bt + Cs	
H6	1. Permitted 3. Permitted 4. The victim should not be punished. He/she can remarry.	Bt + Cs	2. It is for curing, not for divorce	Bt	
W7	1. After serious efforts to reconcile fail. 3. After all efforts fail.	Bt	Divorce is not biblical 2. No ground for divorce but for curing	Bt + Cs	

			4. No		
H7			Biblically "no divorce" 1. Instead divorce, allow for reconciliation. 2. Temporary separation for safety and to work on the problem. 3. They should pray and seek help. 4. No, unless the spouse is dead.	Bt	
W8	1. After seeking reconciliation. 3. Work out the problem first	Bt	Bible does not permit divorce. 2. Separation for protection and treatment 4. No	Bt + Cs	
H8			Biblical conviction, not good for children, huge cost, bad for him	Bt + Cs	1. Not sure what the Bible teaches. 2. Not sure 3. Not sure 4. Not sure what the Bible teaches on this.
W9			No divorce because of Biblical conviction 1. Not reason, but may result in divorce 2. Separation for protection, counseling and change. 3. No reason, but may result in divorce. 4. No. Not conducive for possible reconciliation.	Bt + Cs	

H9			Bible teaches no divorce. 1. The problem must be worked out. 2. The problem must be worked out. 3. Marital problems must be worked out. 4. Permissible after the spouse has died.	Bt	
W10			No divorce, because of Biblical conviction, Filipino culture, parents and relatives modeling 1. No reason for divorce 2. Separation for protection of the victim. 3. No reason for divorce 4. No divorce, thus no remarriage after divorce.	Bt + Pm + Cu + Cs	
H10	1. You cannot force anybody to live up to a commitment. 2. Abuse is dangerous. 4. Permitted for the victim.	Cs	No divorce because of Biblical teaching, personal and others' experience, parents' model 3. They must try everything possible to rebuild trust. Easier said than done	Bt + Pm + reality	
W11	1. Yes, but a lot can be done before taking this step. 2. No one should tolerate violence in the home. 3. Do everything first before divorce. 4. She believes in second chance.	Bt + Cs	No divorce because of Biblical teaching (Matt 19: 6), Filipino culture, parents' model	Bt + Cu + Pm	
H11	2. Permitted. No one should continue to be tortured.	Bt + Cs	1. No reason for divorce. They must work out the problem.	Bt	

	3. After efforts to work out the problem fail. 4. Permissible				
W12	1. After all efforts to reconcile fail. 3. Try everything possible first to fix the marriage.	Bt	2. Separation for protection and treatment.	Cs	4. Not sure if the Bible allows it.
H12	1. Yes, if the spouse is already remarried, no chance for reconciliation. 2. Separation is needed for change. It can lead to divorce. 3. Permitted but never prescribed 4. Permissible for the victim.	Bt + Cs			
W13	1. If the abandoning spouse is an unbeliever, divorce is permissible. 2. The Bible does not allow violence. 3. Permitted 4. Remarriage for the victim is permitted.	Bt + Cs	God hates divorce.	Bt	
H13	1. If the spouse that abandons is a non-believer, divorce is possible. 2. If the offender does not want to repent or change, he/she may be treated as unbeliever. Divorce is permissible. 3. Permitted 4. Permissible for the victim in the case the non-believer spouse abandons the believing spouse (1 Cor. 7).	Bt	No divorce, but there can be exceptions	Bt	
W14	3. Permitted	Bt	Bible is against divorce	Bt	1. Not sure yet what is stated in the Bible. 2. She struggles. She

					is not sure yet what the Bible says. 4. Not sure yet what the Bible teaches about this.
H14			Absolutely no divorce. Parents and siblings' model. They are Roman Catholics. 1. No reason for divorce. 2. Temporary separation for safety 3. No reason for divorce, but they need to seek help to work out the problem. 4. Permissible only when the spouse has died.	Pm + Bt	
W15	1. Not advisable but sometimes unavoidable. The victim must wait and try to reconcile first. 2. Divorce is permitted for victims of abuse when there is a threat to life, but first separation for treatment. 3. Divorce is permitted. 4. Victims of abuse and adultery may remarry	Bt + Cs	No divorce. 4. Victims of abandonment must wait to allow for reconciliation.	Bt	
H15	1. There must be case-by-case consideration. 3. Permitted	Bt + Cs	No divorce 2. The abused and the children must leave. It can be separation, but not divorce. 4. Be reconciled or remain unmarried (1 Cor. 7)	Bt	
W16	1. One cannot force anybody to stay if they want to leave	Cs + Bt	No divorce (Matt 19: 6). As couple they passed through tough	Bt + Pm + Cs	

	<p>2. As "last ditch"</p> <p>4. It is permissible for the victim but not advisable. Blended family is not the ideal.</p>		<p>times, they stuck together for the sake of their children. Also parents' model</p> <p>3. No reason for divorce.</p>		
H16	<p>3. Permitted but not pleasing to God</p>	Bt	<p>Bible teaches marriage vow is permanent (Matt 19:6). His brother's divorce confirms his view. It was hard on the kids.</p> <p>1. No reason for divorce.</p> <p>2. May be reason for separation but not for divorce.</p> <p>4. Problems are not fixed by divorce and remarrying.</p>	Bt + reality + Cs	
W17	<p>1. They must try to work out the problem and consider the children first.</p> <p>2. Permitted.</p> <p>3. Consideration of the children must be the basis for deciding to divorce or not.</p>	Bt + Personal exp. + Cs	<p>Bible teaches no divorce, her culture too.</p> <p>4. She has not given much thought. Of the top of her head it is not and option.</p>	Bt + Cu	
H17	<p>1. If there is abuse involved.</p> <p>2. Permitted.</p> <p>3. Depends on case-by-case situation. There must be consideration for the children.</p> <p>4. Permissible when the divorce is legitimate.</p>	Bt + Personal exp. + Cs	<p>He is against divorce because of Biblical teaching and personal experience of parents' divorce</p>	Bt + Personal exp.	
W18	<p>1. Where adultery is involved.</p> <p>2. Permitted</p> <p>3. Permissible where the divorce is acceptable.</p>	Bt + Cs	<p>Bible does not allow divorce.</p> <p>4. Separation to work out the problem</p>	Bt	
H18	<p>1. Must be evaluated case by case. If there is adultery, it is permitted.</p>	Bt + Cs			

	<p>2. If there is danger to physical harm and efforts to get the abuser treated fail.</p> <p>3. After all efforts fail.</p> <p>4. Case by case situation, e.g. permissible when the partner is remarried anyway.</p>				
W19	2. Permitted	Cu + Pm	<p>No divorce (her Filipino culture and parents' model).</p> <p>1. No, unless spouse files divorce</p> <p>3. No, unless spouse files divorce</p>	Cu + Pm	4. She has not given thought. Not sure what is in the Bible.
H19	<p>1. The person must be called to repentance, the church must confront and counsel. If the state already grants legal divorce, the church must accept it.</p> <p>2. Separation first, the church must counsel the abuser. If there is no change, divorce is permissible.</p> <p>3. Permitted but not mandated.</p> <p>4. Yes, if the divorce agrees with the Biblical parameters for divorce.</p>	Bt + Cs	Divorce is permissible in certain cases, but never mandated. There can be 2 <sup>nd</sup> chances (“recycling program”)	Bt	
W20	<p>1. It must be after a long period of time of waiting for possible reconciliation.</p> <p>3. Exception (Mt. 19:6)</p>	Bt + Cs	<p>2. No reason for divorce. Separation may be needed.</p> <p>4. Only when the spouse is dead.</p>	Bt Cs	
H20			No divorce. Couples must find a way to discuss and solve differences	Cs	<p>1. He has not thought about it.</p> <p>2. He has not thought about it. Everybody should decide on their own.</p>

					<p>3. He has not thought about it.</p> <p>4. Remarriage after divorce is ok, but he wonders about the acceptability, when the person divorces and remarries several times.</p>
W21	<p>1. Reconciliation must be sought first.</p> <p>2. Permitted</p> <p>3. It is last resource, reconciliation must be pursued (Mt.19)</p>	Bt + Cs	4. Only when the spouse has died.	Bt	
H21	<p>2. Yes, if it is dangerous to safety.</p> <p>3. Permitted</p>	Bt	<p>Divorce is against the Bible.</p> <p>4. Not permitted, though people do it.</p>	Bt	1. Not sure what is stated in the Bible
W22	<p>1. If a long time has passed there is no news, there is no relationship</p> <p>2. When there is threat to life.</p> <p>4. She believes in second chances, though remarriage should not be encouraged.</p>	Bt + Cs	<p>The Bible teaches "no divorce".</p> <p>3. No reason for divorce. Her mother continued to put up and forgave her father because of Biblical teaching on love and forgiveness.</p>	Bt + Pm + Feelings	
H22	<p>1. Permitted</p> <p>2. Permitted in abuse and other situations like the spouse turns gay.</p> <p>3. Reconciliation must be sought, but if the erring spouse is habitually unfaithful, permitted</p> <p>4. When the divorce is acceptable, permitted</p>	Bt + Cs + reality			
W23	<p>1. Yes, if one of them is unwilling to work on the marriage.</p> <p>2. Permitted</p>	Cs + Bt	4. Based on personal feeling, may be there should not be remarriage.	Feelings	

	3. All resources to fix the marriage must be exhausted first				
H23	Divorce is permissible but not advisable. 1. Must be evaluated case by case. 2. Permitted 3. Permitted, but case-by-case evaluation. 4. Acceptable	Bt + Cs			

The result shows that both the participants who were absolutely against divorce and remarriage, and those who proposed case by case treatment on issues of permissibility of divorce and remarriage, based their view on their understanding of Biblical teaching, or on Biblical teaching combined with elements of common sense, parental modeling, culture or experience. Those who did not know what the Bible teaches in dealing with case-by-case situations were not sure which position to take.

## II. The understanding of sacrificial love and the basis for the view.

Table G 2 shows the responds to the question: “How would you explain sacrificial love?” (“Is your concept based on Biblical teaching, parental modeling, common sense, culture, etc.?”)

**Table G 2**

Cd	Biblical teaching	Common sense	Combinations	Base
W1	It is when you do for the other, even when you do not want to do it. But it must be reasonable sacrifice. It is part of maturity. Immature people are selfish. Jesus taught sacrificial love.			Bt
H1	Christ gave himself for the church. You serve the other even when you do not like it.			Bt

W2		It must be mutual. It is reciprocity, not just one partner sacrifices all the time. It is commonsense.		Cs
H2	It is taught in the Bible. Husbands are to love their wives as Christ loves the church. However, it should not be foolish or unreasonable.			Bt
W3			Sacrificing for someone you love is not a burden. It is satisfying.	Bt + Model -ing of Believ - vers
H3	Sacrificial love is taught in the Bible, but it should not be for unreasonable purposes.			Bt
W4			Sacrificial love is needed for the sake of the marriage and the children. It is based on Biblical teaching, her parents' model and common sense	Bt + Pm + Cs
H4	The marriage vow means commitment to sacrifice if needed. Keeping the covenant is Biblical			Bt
W5		She and her husband sacrifice for their children. This kind of love is most needed in parental love. It is based more common on sense than Biblical teaching.		Cs
H5			It is biblical and commonsense. When you meet your spouse's need, even by doing things you	Bt + Cs

			may not like, she is happy, and in the end your own need is fulfilled too.	
W6	It is Biblical teaching. Often we do not want to sacrifice for the loved-one because we are selfish.			Bt
H6	Sacrificing for your spouse is taught in the Bible, but it cannot be unhealthy and unreasonable. It must be valid sacrifice.			Bt
W7	Sacrificing for your partner means you do not always get what you want. It is the test of love. It is Biblical teaching.			Bt
H7	If you love someone, sacrifice for that person is not a suffering. It's Biblical			Bt
W8			The Bible teaches sacrificial love. You must be willing to sacrifice for the sake of the children	Bt + Cu
H8		Sacrificial love is not a suffering if you love the person. It's commonsense.		Cs
W9	Sacrificial love must be mutual between spouses. If one loves, it is not a burden to sacrifice for the other. It is Biblical.			Bt
H9	Sacrificial love for my wife is Biblical. The leader is the servant, and not the boss.			Bt
W10	There is no real sacrifice if you love someone, because you don't want			Bt

	the loved-one to be hurt. It is Biblical.			
H10	They have passed through unexpected testing during the first years of their marriage. He stuck to his commitment because he loved her. Love involves commitment.			Bt
W11			Sacrificial love is taught in the Bible, but there must be common sense in its application. Generally, it is good to sacrifice for the spouse, but if the husband has an infectious disease, the wife would not sacrifice herself to get infected.	Bt + Cs
H11			The Bible teaches sacrificial love. It is also worth it to sacrifice for the spouse.	Bt + Cs
W12	Sacrificial love for the spouse depends on what it is about. It must be for acceptable reasons. It is Biblical			Bt
H12	Sacrificial love is taught in the Bible, for instance husbands are to love their wife as Christ loves the Church.			Bt
W13	It is Biblical teaching. Serving, sacrificing and submission are taught in the Bible.			Bt
H13	The Bible teaches sacrificial love, but it must be in actions that please God.			Bt

W14	It is definitely Biblical. It is unconditional love. In the practice she is still struggling because of her upbringing. Now that she knows Biblical teaching, she is changing.			Bt
H14			A person who does not get fulfillment out of sacrificing for the spouse is childish and selfish. He learned this from parents' model and Biblical teaching.	Pm + Bt
W15	It is Biblical teaching. She became aware of it after she read books that teach Biblical principles of marriage. Her Bible study group helps strengthen her conviction and integrate it in decision-making process.			Bt
H15	The model of sacrificial love is Christ. However, it should not become unreasonable. It should be for legitimate reasons.			Bt
W16			Even if your spouse does not deserve it, you must love. You must forgo your needs and wants for the sake of the marriage. The Bible teaches: "Accept one another as God has accepted us." We build harmony by loving sacrificially. This is Biblical, but also her mother served her father sacrificially.	Bt + Pm

H16	Sacrificial love means putting the need of your spouse and children above yours. It means not getting your wants all the time. This is Biblical. Jesus teaches laying down your life for others.			Bt
W17		She will do what would make her husband happy, but if it is something against her own will or her own good, she will tell him. She will let him decide, if he insists on it.		Cs
H17			Sacrificial love is taught in the Bible. Christ died on the cross. He also saw examples of some Christians who love sacrificially.	Bt + Model-ing of others
W18		It means doing things you do not like to do, for the other person's sake. She sacrifices by forgoing her good job and career to take care of their kids. This is commonsense.		Cs
H18			It is giving up personal desires for the benefit of the spouse. It is unconditional love. There has to be a lot of this to make a marriage. It is Biblical teaching, and his parents' modeling	Bt + Pm

W19			Sacrificial love is necessary in marriage. Her view is based on Biblical principal and the examples of some Christians.	Bt +  Model -ing of others
H19	Sacrificial love means you cannot afford to do your own thing all the time, when you are married. Christ is the model. Phil 2 teaches not only to look for our own interests, but for the interest of others, just like Christ, who by his nature is God, but emptied himself out, humbled himself, took human likeness to serve.			Bt
W20	Sacrificial love means giving up your own interest for the sake of your spouse. It is Biblical. God sacrificed His Son for us, because God loves us so much. If we love, we must be willing to sacrifice for the loved-one.			Bt
H20		Sacrificial love is you give to your partner without expecting something back. This is appropriate in marriage. This is commonsense.		Cs
W21	Sacrificial love means doing something out of one's comfort zone for the other person. She admits that she sometimes complained, but			Bt

	did it anyway. It is the Biblical principle of love.			
H21		Sacrificial love means doing for the other person what you do not normally want to do. He does this to his wife, because she does it to him. She is better in this. He has to work more on it. It is commonsense.		Cs
W22			There are examples of sacrificial love in the Bible. Christ died on the cross; Abraham sacrificed Isaac. Her willingness to give up what she would like or need for the sake of her husband and children is sacrificial love on a small scale. The result is good relationship and the joy returns to her. Also, her mother modeled it.	Bt + Cs + Pm
H22	Sacrificial love for the spouse is like giving up something that you like for the sake of meeting the spouse's need. This is taught in the Bible. Christ laid down His life to please the Father. Abraham gave up Isaac to please God. We are to think of others' interest more highly than our own.			Bt
W23			This is doing everything for the person you love,	Bt + Cs

			considering the other person's interest before your own. This is Biblical teaching. Marriage partners must sacrifice something of themselves to become one with the spouse. It is also commonsense to make a relationship work, to keep the marriage for a lifetime; you must sacrifice for the other.	
H23			It is willingness to do good for the other, even though you are hurt by it. It is because Christ died on the cross for us. It is Biblical teaching, and also his parents modeled this.	Bt + Pm

The result shows three possible influences: Sacrificial love is based on Biblical teaching; sacrificial love is based on common sense, and combinations of Biblical teaching with modeling of parents or other believers, common sense, or culture.

Furthermore, among the wives, 11 (47.8%) perceive Biblical teaching as the basis for sacrificial love, whereas 8 (34.7%) mention Biblical teaching strengthened by one or more of the other influences. Parental modeling is mentioned 3 times. Added to that, culture is mentioned once, and other Christians' modeling twice. However, 4 wives (17.3%) mention common sense as the only basis for sacrificial love.

On the other hand, 14 husbands (60.8%) mention Biblical teaching as the basis for sacrificial love; 6 (26%) express that Biblical teaching and one or more of the other elements as the basis for sacrificial love. Parental modeling appears 3 times, and

other Christians' modeling once. Common sense as the sole basis appears 3 times (13%) among the husbands.

The majority experience Biblical teaching, or Biblical teaching strengthened by parental or other people's modeling, common sense, or culture as the basis for their concept of sacrificial love. However, for 4 wives (17.3%), and 3 husbands (13%) sacrificial love is only based on common sense.

Item H. Perspective on Having Children (Adjustment concerning the value of children)

The participants answer question: "How do you decide on the size of the family?"

Note: Biblical teaching is coded (Bt), common sense (Cs), culture (Cu), etc.

The couples that live in North America (16)

**Table H 1**

W1	She says it is unlike the Filipinos in the old days. The size of family is not an issue. It's as many as we can care for.	Cs	H1	Size of family is not an issue. It's commonsense.	Cs
W2	She thinks two or three children may be nice, but they are childless. She works in childcare, though they don't have their own children.	Circumstances	H2	They have tried, but remained childless. They have accepted it. She works with children.	Circumstances
W3	She says that she does not stick to the Filipino tradition. She came from a family of ten. There was not enough money to give education to the children. For her the issue is how many you can afford.	Cs	H3	The number of children is not an issue. They have three.	Cs
W4	The number of children depends on their financial and emotional capacity.	Cs	H4	He has never given thought about how many. They have three, may be that gives them three personalities.	Not given thought

W5	She came from a big family. Parents in a huge family cannot give enough or equal attention to all children. They have two	Cs	H5	It depends on their financial, emotional, and other capacities.	Cs
W6	It depends on their capacity to raise the children and to give them good education. They have two.	Cs	H6	Financial questions are involved in deciding how many children to have.	Cs
W7	The Lord decides for their capacity to have children. She accepts it from the Lord. They have one.	Circumstances	H7	It is related to his health condition.	Circumstances
W8	Her first child was born when she was 45. Her concern is how to get their children through college. They have two.	Cs	H8	They have decided together to have only two, because of their age.	Cs
W9	They prefer to have two because of medical reasons.	Cs	H9	They decided to have two because of common sense.	Cs
W10	They are happy to have one child after 7 yrs. of marriage. She does not expect more because of her age.	Cs	H10	The Filipino people can have many children because they have the support of extended family. In North America one or two is enough.	Cs
W11	They decided what works best for them.	Cs	H11	The ideal number is probably two or three. They have two. The more children, the more strength you would need. With more, it would be more stressful.	Cs
W12	She married late, so that she has difficulties having children. She has accepted it.	Circumstances	H12	They have no children, because they married late. She had several miscarriages. They have accepted it. Happiness does not depend on how many children they have.	Circumstances
W19	Due to negative experience in her own big family. She prefers a small family. She and her husband agreed to have two. How many	Cs	H19	Couples can have as many as they can provide for. Two or three is ideal. It's commonsense. They are in the process of	Cs

	depends of God's provision. It's commonsense.			adopting a Filipino boy. They are childless.	
W20	They do not have children. She married late. She had negative experiences from being of a big family. Her parents did not have enough money to provide for good education for most of them.	Circumstances + Cs	H20	He has two adult children by his deceased wife. Two children are ideal. It depends on your income.	Cs
W21	They are childless. She came from a family of four. Theoretically four kids would be ideal.	Cs	H21	They have no children, but four would be ideal. One is not enough, two is better, and four is an even number. It depends on the resource of time and money.	Cs
W23	They married late. They adopted one son. They do not have the energy to adopt more children. It's the age factor.	Cs	H23	They were in their 40s. when they got married. They adopted one child. Based on common sense.	Cs

The couples that live in the Philippines (7)

**Table H 2**

W13	Though children are blessings from God, even a childless couple is a complete family. God decides to give or not to give children. Also, couples must decide if they can handle many children.	Bt + Cs	H13	God gives joy in whatever circumstances whether you have children or not, although children are blessings from God.	Bt + Cs
W14	She would love to have a big family, because it is better for the kids to have many siblings, minimum 3 or 4. They have two, because they cannot afford more due to financial and age considerations.	Cs	H14	He would like to have a big family, because he came from a big Roman Catholic family of eight. But one has to adjust to the situation.	Cs
W15	Two or three is good. It's how they can care for them. It's commonsense	Cs	H15	Family of two is enough. He and his wife decided together on this. It's how they can handle.	Cs

W16	She might be happier with a big family, because she came from a big family. Her husband is practical. He said that working overseas and traveling would not be good for a family with many kids. They both agree. They have two, but they work with children.	Cs	H16	He wants fewer children, because of practicality, to be able to provide adequately for the children.	Cs
W17	The number of children depends on how many they can adequately take care of, physically, emotionally, and spiritually.	Cs	H17	A smaller family is better for them, because of the demand of their work. They do not have enough time for each child, if they have more.	Cs
W18	It depends on the availability of time, physical, and financial capacities to care for the children.	Cs	H18	His wife had difficulties with the births of their children, because of her age. They have two. They agreed not to have more.	Cs
W22	A family of four would be ideal, because it is an even number, but the real issue is the economic factor. It's how to provide adequately for the children.	Cs	H22	They started having children at an older age. They have three. His wife had difficult pregnancies. God's will is shown through his wife's physical condition.	Cs

In four cases, circumstances were the decisive factors for the number of children to have. The guiding principle for deciding on the size of the family was generally based on common sense. One husband has not given thought about the decision. The result also shows that the spouses agreed with each other on the perspective of having children, or accepting childlessness. None has a large family.

Item I. Dealing with Differences (Frequent marital issues, dynamics of forgiving one another and making adjustment)





	necessarily apologize. 4. Apologizing is hard for her. May be it's because of pride of admitting wrongs. Her father was like this.	Cu + Pm prevent apology		is "not worth dying for", he would give in and make up with her. If it were serious, after she cools down, he would talk to her about it. 4. He has no problem apologizing. It is probably a combination of personality and common sense.	Pr + Cs
W5	1. At the beginning of their marriage they were nominal Roman Catholics. Before they converted to the Evangelical faith they did not have conflicts about issues of faith. They did not care. The struggles were about in-laws. Now the disagreements are on how to live and communicate their new faith. 2. When she is upset, she refuses to talk. It can take two days or longer. 3. When the issue has cooled off, they try to iron out the differences. They have learned to accept that they are different. 4. They apologize to one another. He apologizes more. She has difficulty apologizing, but she is learning. She says that before it was probably cultural, now they are learning from Biblical teaching	Faith practices  Cu prevents apology but learns it from Bt	H5	1. The issue is probably missed cues, not listening, or missing her words on his part. 2. When he is upset, he keeps quiet to let himself cool down, and to let the issue sit for a while. 3. When they have cooled down, they talk. They try to make compromises. They forgive one another. 4. They are learning this forgiving attitude, now that they have become Evangelical, because of Biblical teaching.	Communication  Bt
W6	1. Their different style of disciplining and raising kids. She follows the Filipino principles. The children must respect and obey the parents even after they are 18 yrs old. They can be independent when they are married and have their family. He thinks that they can be on their own when they are 18 yrs. 2. When she is upset, she refuses to talk to him. It can be hours or days. He used to scream when he	Cu	H6	1. They have different spending priorities. They used to argue a lot about this. Now they have grown closer and more accustomed to seeking middle ground. 2. He used to raise his voice when he was upset. He got this from his Mom. When their children were small, when he disagreed he talked louder and louder, and the kids became even louder.	Spending priority

	<p>was upset. He does not anymore. She used to think very badly of people who raise their voice. That is her culture.</p> <p>3. He believes in the Biblical teaching of not letting the sun go down with your anger. She is improving in this because the Bible says it. After the issue cools down, they would try to seek agreement or compromise.</p> <p>4. He is the one who says sorry. She thinks she may be hardheaded, or it is hard for her to apologize because of her culture. He is more flexible. It is culture and personality.</p>	Cu / Pr prevents apology		<p>3. To resolve disagreements, they let things cool off, and then find a middle ground.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more often. She is stubborn. His apologizing is based on the Bible, but also personality.</p>	Bt + Pr
W7	<p>1. The issue about planning vacation trips, and how to spend money.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she refuses to talk or avoids it.</p> <p>3. When things have cooled down, they discuss the issue, and iron out the differences. They pray and count the money. Usually, they decide what they can afford now, and wait when they cannot buy it now.</p> <p>4. She would apologize as needed. This she acquired from Biblical teaching. In her family, when her parents disagreed, they did not talk, they did not apologize.</p>	Priorities  Bt (not her Cu)	H7	<p>1. Differences on priority in spending money. He is more frugal. She spends more superfluously. He considers options, quality, and durability of items. He does research, looks for sales etc. She is more spontaneous. She wants things faster, quick fix, and she does less planning.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he keeps quiet to let the issue cool off. Then he thinks it over.</p> <p>3. When they both have cooled off, they discuss the issue, pray, and if needed bring in a third party for more objective counsel. This person is a friend they both respect.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more. It is because the Bible taught to consider others, how others are affected. Perhaps, he also makes more mistakes than she does. He accepts his failures before the Lord.</p>	Spending priority  Bt

				He was raised in these values in his Sunday School.	
W8	<p>1. It is about help in the house. In the Philippines, when relatives help in the house, or baby-sit, it is free of charge. When his sister baby-sits for them, she must be paid. He told her to pay. She cannot understand this, though she paid.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she refuses to talk. It used to be for a week. Now it is for one or two days, then she forgets the issue and starts talking.</p> <p>3. When the issue has cooled they just forget the disagreement and go on with life.</p> <p>4. Nobody says sorry. After a while they just forget the issue.</p>	<p>Money + Cu (in-laws)</p> <p>No reason for apology</p>	H8	<p>1. It is about how much money to send to the Philippines.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he stops talking. They can be silent for a day.</p> <p>3. They would talk over when to send the money. If they can do it, they would send it, if not they would wait.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more often, than she does. It's not only because of Biblical teaching. He forgives her because he loves her. It is reasonable that discussions come to an agreement.</p>	<p>Money + Cu (in-laws)</p> <p>Bt+ Cs</p>
W9	<p>1. It is related to their work. They work together. She is more concerned with smooth interpersonal relationship. He is more direct, though he has learned more of how to deal with people the Filipino way, "delicadeza".</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she keeps silent for several hours to let her emotion cool down.</p> <p>3. After she has cooled down, they discuss and settle the issue.</p> <p>4. She apologizes if she is wrong. He does the same. She did not learn this from her parents, but from Biblical teaching.</p>	<p>Cu</p> <p>Bt (not her Cu)</p>	H9	<p>1. He does not notice any frequent issue of disagreement. He respects her opinions.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he would wait until he cools down to deal with the issue.</p> <p>3. They resolve disagreements by talking it over.</p> <p>4. Both have no problem apologizing, if they sense that they were wrong. It is both Biblical and commonsense.</p>	<p>Not conscious of any</p> <p>Bt + Cs</p>
W10	<p>1. He is often too frank, or lacking "tact" in saying something. She thinks: "You need to sugar coat the truth in order not to hurt people".</p> <p>2. When she is upset she keeps silent.</p>	Cu	H10	<p>1. Differences about prioritizing time and planning. He likes to take time and not to be rushed. He is a perfectionist. He wants things done right the first time. She is not</p>	Priority of time

	<p>3. He is a flexible man. They seek compromise.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more often. Apologizing is hard for her. She cannot explain why. May be culture</p>	Cu prevents apology		<p>concerned about perfection.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he takes "time out": get some tea, walk outside, or watch TV until he has cooled down.</p> <p>3. After he has cooled down, they talk things over and try to compromise.</p> <p>4. He is more flexible. He apologizes more often than she does. It is not hard for him, because this is how he was brought up and how it was modeled in his family.</p>	Cu + Pm
W11	<p>1. It is perhaps related to sexual relation and emotional needs. May be because he is a man and she is a woman. She tends to like more touching and expressions of affection. She is more expressive. He is not expressive. She has accepted the differences. These are not the most important things in life.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she refuses to talk. He is a quiet man. He does not vocalize irritation.</p> <p>3. He initiates communication. They would talk over the issue and try the art of compromising.</p> <p>4. They apologize to one another. It is not hard for her to apologize when she knows she is wrong. She definitely used to be more stubborn and strong-willed. She is changing now because of Biblical teaching.</p>	<p>Expres- sion of affection</p> <p>Bt (not her Pr)</p>	H11	<p>1. The issue of priorities. For example, she wants a new car and he does not think it was necessary yet. She wants to move to the city to be closer to work. He does not think they need it now. She is action and goal oriented. He is less of that nature.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he stops talking to cool down.</p> <p>3. When they have differences they stop talking and wait until the issue has cooled down. Then they discuss it. They usually compromise.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more than she does. This is based on Biblical teaching such as, treating others, as you want yourself to be treated.</p>	<p>Priority</p> <p>Bt</p>
W12	<p>1. Orderliness is often an issue. He is a little messy. Often there is also difficulty in communication. He mumbles when he speaks. When she does not understand him, she repeats her questions, often 3 times. He would get upset, and then she</p>	Pr	H12	<p>1. It has to do with her complains that he collects too much stuff in the house. She is orderly. He does not organize his things. It is a matter of having time to tidy up. For him to get tidying up done is a</p>	Pr + language barrier



				than she does, even when he does not feel he is wrong. It sounds insincere, but apologizing is to extend "olive branch" of peace.	Cs
W20	<p>1. It is about money and cultural values regarding family. In her culture, the family is very important. One must always support one's family. Frequent disagreements are about sending money to her relatives. In his culture everybody is on his own.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she tends to raise her voice, and then stop talking to him, may be a day.</p> <p>3. She would initiate talking again because of her Biblical conviction, not to let the sun go down with anger. Then they talk. They decide what to do about the problem. They either compromise, or leave the issue, if it is not important anyway.</p> <p>4. Whoever is wrong apologizes. She apologizes easily and often, because she realizes that no one is always right. The Bible teaches not to let the sun go down with your anger. Apologizing is a way of finding peace, rather than maintaining anger.</p>	<p>Cu (Money for relatives)</p> <p>Bt</p>	H20	<p>1. It is about priority in spending money. For example, they recently built a house in the Philippines. He wants everything to work well and to be worth the price. She is not so particular.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he raises his voice.</p> <p>3. They quarrel then seek compromise, or leave the issue and move on.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more than she does, because he wants peace.</p>	<p>Spending money</p> <p>Cs</p>
W21	<p>1. The issue is often about money in regards to helping her family. They have cultural differences in their perspective.</p> <p>2. When she is upset she verbalizes it. She raises her voice. She does not keep silent.</p> <p>3. They discuss the issue. Usually they agree to disagree until the issue surface again.</p> <p>4. She thinks that she apologizes more than he does. This is because of conviction of the Holy Spirit. It is based on</p>	<p>Cu (money for relatives)</p>	H21	<p>1. Money issue. The in-laws often borrow money and do not pay back.</p> <p>2. When he is upset he expresses it in words, then drops the issue until the subject comes up again.</p> <p>3. They do not have a method to resolve this problem. The same issue still comes up frequently.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more than she does. It is based on common sense.</p>	<p>Money for in-laws</p> <p>Cs</p>

	Biblical teaching: "Do not let the sun go down with your anger."	Bt			
W23	<p>1. The issue is about scheduling housework.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she would give him a "silent treatment". it can last for one day.</p> <p>3. He would initiate talking again. They talk over the issue. They would come to an agreement or a compromise.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more often than she does. It does not come quickly or naturally with her. It is because of personality, but she knows that when she is wrong she needs to apologize for the sake of the relationship.</p>	<p>House-chores</p> <p>Pr prevents apology</p>	H23	<p>1. Sometimes the way they spend money can cause disagreement.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he raises his voice.</p> <p>3. Several options for resolving disagreement: let the other have their way, discuss, then agree to disagree, compromise, or just forget about it.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more often. This is based both on Biblical teaching and common sense. The Bible teaches that meaningful relationship is more important than proving to be right, or that the other is wrong. It is also commonsense. When there is a problem an apology in needed to maintain the relationship.</p>	<p>Spending money</p> <p>Bt + Cs</p>

Thus, the following information stands out:

Ten of the wives (62.5%) recognized the element of culture in their issue of disagreements, while only 5 of their husbands (31.2%) did so.

All 16 wives refuse to talk when they are upset, although 2 among them first raise their voice then refuse to talk ("silent treatment"). Nine of the husbands (56.2%) are quiet until they cool down ("time out") then try to verbalize the issue. Seven husbands (43.7%) vocalized their frustration immediately. Among them 3 are used to talk when they are upset, and another three raise their voice, and one verbalizes, and then drops the issue completely until it reoccurs.

Waiting for either the issue to cool or the person to cool down first, and then to discuss the issue appears to be the way for resolving issues for 9 couples (56.2%) in this group. Talking out the problem is prevalent among all couples, and the conclusion can be by coming to a compromise, an agreement, to agree to disagree, or to drop the issue. In the case of the disagreement over sending money to the wife's extended family, one couple seeks agreement of whether they can send the money now or later. In another similar case, the couple still has not found a resolution for the problem. They agree to disagree until the issue surfaces again.

Eleven wives (68.7%) acknowledged that asking for forgiveness or apologizing does not come naturally to them or was not the way they were brought up with. Among them 10 (62.5%) mentioned the possibility of cultural elements that may not be conducive to offering apology or asking forgiveness, although in a few cases other elements, such as personality may also come into play. One wife did not recognize the need for apologizing in their disagreements at all. Seven (43.7%) of the 16 also underlined the influence of Biblical teaching in helping them to learn to apologize. None of the wives mentioned common sense as an influencing factor in learning to apologize.

The 16 husbands do not have problem apologizing. Nine of them (56.25%) mentioned Biblical teaching as an influencing element for them to apologize to their wives, but also the element of common sense was mentioned 9 times as one of the influencing factor. Also, common sense was the basis for apologizing in four cases. One man mentioned having learned apologizing from culture, and another man from culture combined with parental modeling.

The couples that live in the Philippines (7)

**Table I 2**

W13	<p>1. She tends to be more concerned with how others feel. He is more direct. She thinks that this is just because she is a woman. He is upset when she expects him to read her mind, for instance, when she needed more emotional affirmation.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she first remains quiet, then she explodes, raising her voice. It is like a spurt of expression of frustration.</p> <p>3. To solve disagreements, she takes time to cool down, and then she apologizes.</p> <p>4. She apologizes more than he does. She learned this from Biblical teaching. Her mother was proud, and was not used to apologizing.</p>	<p>Gender differences</p> <p>Bt</p>	H13	<p>1. The differences are in their perspective. She tends to think in terms of how it is done customary and culturally. He thinks biblically. For example, he wanted to give their maids 2 days off weekly. She thought that it was improper, because in her culture it is customary to give only once a week off. Biblically, he thinks that it is right to treat them, as you want yourselves to be treated.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he would be quiet to cool down.</p> <p>3. When the issue is not really "something to die for", he would just forget it. If it were important, after cooling down, he would talk about it. They compromise, or agree to disagree.</p> <p>4. They ask for forgiveness to one another. She apologizes more than he does. He learned asking for forgiveness, because of Biblical teaching. He had no consistent upbringing in his family.</p>	<p>Cu</p> <p>Bt</p>
W14	<p>1. Issues of attitude to finances, time and food. They are both frugal, but they want to use the money differently. He is an entrepreneur. He wants to risk in investments. She is tired of it, because she is the one who works to earn the money. She likes to take her time. He is always in a rush. She likes to chat and socialize. He thinks it is a waste of time. For her food is an enjoyment. She likes to spend time and money on it.</p>	<p>Values of money, time, and food.</p>	H14	<p>1. Petty issues because of different temperaments. She analyses a lot, accuses him of over-simplification. She worries about all sorts of things that hardly ever happen. She is a packrat and has trouble finding her things.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he tends to blow up, then forget it. When he blows up, she internalizes it. The situation gets worse, because she becomes miserable. She gives him a</p>	<p>Pr</p>

	<p>For him eating is a chore.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she holds in until she explodes. Then she raises her voice, after that she remains silent for several hours.</p> <p>3. After a while, she ignores the problem. He approaches her and apologizes.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more often than she does. It comes easier to him. Actually, she learned to apologize from him. She was brought up not to apologize. He is a good example in that regard</p>	<p>Cu prevents apology, but learning from husband</p>		<p>silent treatment. She ruminated and stewed. He thinks the issue is trivial, but for her another day is ruined.</p> <p>3. He approaches her and apologizes. If the issue is not important, he will let it go.</p> <p>4. He apologizes verbally. It is easier for him than for her. She apologizes but not verbally. She sends a text message. He believes he learned asking forgiveness from the Bible, from parents, and it is commonsense. An impasse is exhausting</p>	<p>Pm + Bt + Cs</p>
W15	<p>1. Cultural differences. In her family, food is a high priority. Food is an enjoyment. For him, food is a necessity. Sometimes he thinks that she spends more money and time on food than necessary. The issue of smooth interpersonal relationship can also be an issue.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she is quiet and it shows in her facial expression. Basically, she is quiet to avoid saying the wrong things. She can remember what she was taught from the Bible during childhood, that in the multitude of words there can be many sins. She stays quiet to let the anger subside.</p> <p>3. He would try to talk to her. He would apologize. They talk over the issue.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more than she does. It is hard for her to apologize verbally. It's her upbringing. This is part of her culture. She is learning it from the Bible where it says that we need to have an attitude of humility, Phil 2:3, and not to</p>	<p>Cu prevents apology but learns from Bt</p>	H15	<p>1. It is "conventionality", but the basis for this is more the different personalities and how they were raised than the different cultures. She came from a family of girls and was raised in a protective environment. He was a farm boy. He is accustomed to dirt and outdoor life. She tends to be over-protective of their children. In spite of the cultural differences, they get along with each other better than had he married a North American woman.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he first becomes quiet, after about an hour he would approach her to talk about the issue. He cannot stand negative feedbacks in a row, for instance, forms of gestures, looks and comments that show disapproval of him. He gets upset.</p> <p>3. He notices when she is upset from her facial expression and when she is quiet. He usually initiates the conversation. They talk through the issue.</p>	<p>Pr</p>

	let the sun go down with anger, Eph 4:26. She learned not to do "silent treatment" for solving problems.			4. He apologizes more often than she does. This is probably because of Biblical teaching on forgiveness (Matt 18, the Lord's Prayer). He also teaches conflict management. The relationship is more important than being right.	Bt
W16	<p>1. The issue is money in relation to her extended family.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she raises her voice, then give him a cold shoulder. The silence could last overnight, half a day, or a couple of days, depending on the severity of the issue. She used to be bad-tempered; she is getting better.</p> <p>3. They would talk through the issue to resolve it. He usually approaches her first.</p> <p>4. He usually apologizes first, even if he was not wrong. She would apologize too, but it is more difficult for her, because of pride. This is cultural tendency, not to lose face. Her father also never apologized. She believes she took after him. It's combination of personality and culture.</p>	<p>Cu (money for relatives)</p> <p>Pr + Cu prevent apology</p>	H16	<p>1. The issue is the lack of sense of financial boundary of her extended family.</p> <p>2. When he is upset, he talks about the problem first, then he may say harsh words. When they do not get anywhere, they take "time out" to cool down.</p> <p>3. He does not like having unresolved disagreements. After cooling down, he would go back to talk out the issue until an agreement is reached.</p> <p>4. He apologizes quicker than she does. He remembers the teaching of the Bible about not to let the sun go down with your anger. He learned apologizing and not keeping the anger from the Bible.</p>	<p>Money for relatives</p> <p>Bt</p>
W17	<p>1. They often misinterpret what each other are saying. May be it is an issue of language barrier, but she speaks English fluently. He often did not understand her.</p> <p>2. When she is upset, she yelled at him. When they are upset with one another, they would leave the room.</p> <p>3. When he is upset, he refuses to talk. Then they do not talk to each other for one or two days. They would feel uncomfortable. She would</p>	Communication	H17	<p>1. The issue relates to the behavior of their adopted special needs child. This has been a stress on the family dynamics.</p> <p>2. When he is upset he is quiet. How long he is silent depends on how upset he is. It may be for one hour, or a couple of days. He usually is upset when he is hurt. When he is just irritated he talks about the issue openly. When he is hurt, he stops talking until she approaches him. He feels</p>	Special Child

	<p>approach him. They talk over the issue and try to agree on what needed to happen. If she does not totally agree, she would give in.</p> <p>4. She apologizes more than he does. He would say that she always apologizes but do the same again. She learned apologizing from working with children. She had to teach them to say sorry, so she has to apply it to herself. The Bible teaches that if you know that your brother has something against you, you must leave your offering and go and be reconciled first with your brother before bringing the offering.</p>	Bt		<p>responsible for his family, so that he would talk again.</p> <p>3. They usually talk over the issue and seek a compromise.</p> <p>4. He apologizes. They both apologize. He would apologize, even if he did not think he was wrong. It's just to get the conflict resolved. This is commonsense.</p>	Cs
W18	<p>1. "Conventionality". For her, smooth interpersonal relationship is important. People evaluate her as a Filipina. He is unhappy with her lack of directness or truthfulness in communicating concerns to people. He believes that the Bible teaches direct approach. He does not understand that she has to function according to her Filipino cultural values of not offending people's pride (amor propio), and maintaining good smooth relationships.</p> <p>2. When she is upset she would be quiet. He would notice it, and initiates talking.</p> <p>3. They talk out the issue, even yell, but they would stay in a closed room. They would talk as long as it takes to understand each other's perspective, even if they may not reach a conclusion.</p>	Cu	H18	<p>1. Time management is the issue. Arguments about how much time needs to be devoted to husband and wife relationship. She wants more time.</p> <p>2. When he is upset he would express it frankly and verbally.</p> <p>3. They would talk out the problem until the issue is clear. It does not necessarily result in agreement, but until either they reach a solution, or they can leave the issue for the time being, and go on to other things.</p> <p>4. He apologizes more. She has trouble apologizing, because of her culture. For him, apologizing is first and foremost because of modeling in his family.</p>	<p>Couple's time</p> <p>Pm</p>



This section yield the following information:

Among the couples that reside in the Philippines, 4 wives (57.1%) identified their frequent differences as cultural issues, but only 1 husband did so.

The majority, 5 wives (71.4%) refuse to talk when they are upset but there are some variations among them: One is silent first, then explodes, and raises her voice; another one is silent first then explodes, raises her voice, then refuses to talk for hours; a third one remains silent but shows her anger in her facial expression; the fourth one raises her voice then refuses to talk; the fifth one simply refuses to talk.

One wife yells at her husband when she is upset (her husband refuses to talk when he is upset). One more wife said that she used to refuse to talk when she was upset but has now learned to verbalize her frustration, then takes time to cool down.

Three of the husbands are quiet first to let the issue cool down, then start talking about it. Two verbalize their frustration immediately, and cool off after. One blows up then forgets the issue. One more husband lets the wife have her way first, and if her way does not work out, he becomes "snappy". Only one husband refuses to talk when he is upset (his wife yells at him when she is upset).

For resolving disputes, 3 couples in this group (42.8%) mentioned waiting for the issue or the person to cool down from the upset feeling before discussing the problem. Also, all of the seven couples seem to talk out the issue. The result may be a resolution to the problem, a compromise or simply to understand the perspective of the other person, or to drop the issue. In one case the partners talk over the issue and even yell until they see each other's point and leave the issue, even if it is unresolved. On the other hand, one husband prefers to let his wife have her way in order to have peace.

All 7 wives (100%) admitted that asking for forgiveness or apologizing did not come naturally, or was not from their culture or upbringing. Four of the wives (57.1%)

mentioned Biblical teaching as an influencing element for them to be able to apologize, and 2 of them (28.5%) also included the good example of their husband in this regard.

Five of these husbands (71.4%) attributed their ability to apologize to the influence of Biblical teaching, although with one case it is a combination of Biblical teaching with parental modeling and common sense. Two of the 7 (28.5%) attributed their facility in apologizing to common sense. None of their wives mentioned common sense in this regard.

In 5 cases (71.1%), it was easier for the husband to apologize than for the wife. In one case it was easier for the wife to apologize than for the husband. In this case the husband explained that he did not experience a consistent upbringing, and he learned asking for forgiveness from Biblical teaching. However, also his wife did not learn this attitude from her parents but from Biblical teaching.

### **3.5 Discussion**

The data from questionnaire 1, 2, 3, and 4 are analyzed in light of the more expanded and clearer insight provided by the personal interview. Only the scores of marital commitment and adjustment levels that suggest the relatively worst scenarios of the intercultural couples' relationship will be discussed to highlight the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment, and to avoid unnecessary lengthiness.

It is worth mentioning that, two couples that had marital problems chose not to participate. Another couple with problems concerning children first declined to participate, although later on consented. At the beginning of the personal interview (A. Connecting with Questionnaire 3 and 4), three persons emphasized that when they filled out questionnaire 4 B: 8 ("How often do you and your partner quarrel?"), their quarrels were not serious. Thus, although the participants may be experiencing

marital stresses, they may not be in distress, or they feel they can cope with their situation; otherwise they might not have participated. In other words, this study does not intend to focus on marital distress.

In light of the results, this section will interpret: (1) the significance of the demographic data, (2) the influence of Biblical teaching on marital commitment and adjustment, (3) the influence of church participation on marital commitment and adjustment, and (4) residence in North America or in the Philippines.

### **3.5.1 The significance of the demographic information**

#### 3.5.1.1 Age and Marriage

Over half of the female participants are 33 years old whereas the males are at least 36 years. The shortest length of having been married is 7.25 years. All the women are in their first marriage, and most of the men are also in their first marriage, except for one who is in his 3rd marriage after having been divorced twice, and another one who has previously been a widower. It can be said that they are people who are established in their marriage life.

Unlike Bauzon's sample (1999) of Filipinas who married Japanese in Yamagata, the result of questionnaire 1 shows that over half of the women married for the first time in their 20s, although 39.1% did so in their 30s.

In Bauzon (1996), the Filipinas were generally over 30 years of age, and the age of the husband were 41 to 50 years. He mentioned that the women's motivation for marriage was not so much out of "love", but it was for financial security. The men were more concerned with having offspring. The author assumes that the Filipinas may have been afraid of becoming spinsters (1999:220). In the Philippine culture there is an assumption that women who delayed their marriage may miss the chance for acquiring a "good husband". The status of unmarried women is low in the Philippine society (Beer 1996:173; Bauzon 1999:220). Thus, the majority of the

sample of Evangelical Filipinas with Evangelical North American Caucasian husband may not have married for fear of becoming spinsters.

Questionnaire 1 data also indicates that 39.1% of the men married for the first time in their 30s, and another two at the age of 45. The widower remarried at age 65, and the divorcee married the 3rd time when he was 45. 5 years old. However, the other 39.1% married for the first time in their 20s.

Thus, while the minority of the couples may have out-married for consideration of financial security, or for the procreation of offspring, this motivation cannot be assumed in a general sense. Nonetheless, many of the men (47.8%) married rather late. To the contrary, over half of the women (56.5%) married in their 20s, 39.1% in their 30s, and 4.3% at the age of 40. Thus, it can be assumed that these men and women were mature adults, who can make personal decision and commitment for intermarriage. The couples were ready for "leaving parents and cleaving to the spouse", that is implied in Gen 2:24 (Barber 1974:50).

#### 3.5.1.2 Children

The fact that they have been married at least seven years allows for a time span, in which the couples are raising young children, or teenage children, or are dealing with the issue of childlessness. Booth and White (1980) report that the presence of young children has a corrosive influence on marital stability. Although the presence of preschoolers may deter separation and divorce, it does not keep people from thinking about divorce. Added to that, Olson et al. (1989) point out that marital satisfaction was at the lowest level when the children are adolescents. They also maintain that there are increased marital stresses even during the stage when the family has school-age children (ages 6 to 11).

Moreover, Forna (1992), Sung (1990), and Markoff (1977) found that there were added marital stresses for intercultural marriage associated with ethnicity and culture with regards to children and childrearing issues. Also, Cerroni-Long (1984:40)

referring to Wagatsuma (1973:260) states that most intercultural marriages face higher risks of breakdown in their first decade. The stresses that the couple experiences at the beginning of their marriage is probably the worst. During that time they may have to make adjustment on their stereotypical expectations that may have been present when they decided to marry interculturally.

Among the sample, 34.7% have children in their teens, and 26 % are still raising young children. Also, 21.7% of the couples have remained childless. The last mentioned condition could be stressful for the marriage, if the spouses have not been able to accept their circumstances. Particularly for the wife, the Philippine culture assigns a high value on having children (Andres 1987; Andres and Andres 1987; Matthews 1994; Panopio and Rolda 2000). Therefore, the factor of the presence of children or childlessness in the couples' marital adjustment will be considered in sections 3.5.2.2 Considering divorce, and in 3.5.2.9 The stresses and value of having children.

#### 3.5.1.3 Education

Most of the participants have had college education and only 13% of the women have just had high school background. To the contrary, 21,7% of the women and 34.7 % of the men have had education beyond college level. Thus, the couples are mostly well educated. In general there is not much of a disparity between the level of education of the wives and the husbands. Moreover, the wives can speak English, although most of the husbands do not speak a Philippine language. It means that couples' communication is in English, which may not be the wives' "heart-language". Also, the fact that the majority of the husbands do not speak a Filipino language may be partly the reason why 57.1 % of the husbands who live in the Philippines do not have a warm relationship with their in-laws (Personal Interview E, II. 2).

#### 3.5.1.4 Faith

There is a wide variety in matters of their length of time of being committed Evangelicals. Among the wives 52.1% did not decide to commit themselves to the

Evangelical faith until they were in their 20s and 30s, and 17.3% became Evangelicals between the age of 5 to 9 years.

Among the husbands only two said that they were brought up as Evangelicals from birth. To the contrary, 43.4% became Evangelical in their 20s and 30s. One person converted at the age of 38, and another at the age of 40. While several of these people are in a transitional stage into Evangelicalism, the religious background of their family of origin reveals a complex kaleidoscopic configurations of faith adherence (see Relationship with In-laws, E I. Religious background). It can be assumed that there may be a great diversity in length and depth of the spouses experience in exposure to Biblical teaching. This reality would stress the importance of Biblical teaching in their church and the spouses' joint church participation to promote their Biblical understanding, and consensus and unanimity of Biblical practices between spouses. One couple specifically expresses that they have disagreements in practicing the Evangelical faith as they go through the transitional adjustment from their previous to the present faith (see W 5 in Personal Interview, I. Dealing with Differences).

In this regard, Wilson et al. (1997) mention that frequency of church attendance in their sample of religious fundamentalists increases exposure to like-minded people. Therefore, it reinforces more traditional family values on them. In contrast, where more liberal views are espoused, frequent church attendance in such a context increases the likelihood of the presence of liberal family attitudes and behavior.

Furthermore, Tseng (1977:102-103) mentioned that it is most important for intercultural couples that the spouses share a common goal toward which they are strongly motivated.

The couples in the present study have differences in racial and cultural backgrounds. Their family of origin may also belong to different religions. However, they have at least a common commitment to their shared faith that can be the basis for marriage

and family values and goals. Therefore, for these couples the significance of having common religious values is emphatic. This issue will be evident in the section on church participation.

#### 3.5.1.5 How they met

Gordon (1966:54) refutes the views that present the intermarried person as deviant or rebellious against parents. In his view, intercultural marriage is more the product of urbanization, mobility, propinquity and other significant factors in society. The personal interview (B. How they met) discloses that propinquity through work, church, study, and social events were instrumental in getting the partners acquainted with one another. Uniquely in this intercultural matchmaking are the intermediary of friends and relatives, and a pen-pal club. However, none of the Evangelical Filipina wives was a "mail-order bride".

Cahill (1990) submits that many Filipinas, who intermarry with foreigners, even when they are not "mail-order brides", suffer the rejection of society, because of the publicized reputation of the "mail-order brides". Simmons (2001) confirms that the Philippines is the major sending country of foreign brides. However, Ordoñez (1997:136) states that only 21% of Filipinas, who married interculturally, do so through the mail-order bride arrangement.

The wives in this study do not mention feeling rejected by society, but they seek to be members of Evangelical churches where they can feel accepted and comfortable. This implies that there are churches where they do not feel comfortable or accepted.

### **3.5.2 The influence of Biblical teaching on marital commitment and adjustment**

#### 3.5.2.1 The constraining force of Biblical teaching and social pressure

Social Pressure, and one's view about the unacceptability of divorce are some of the external forces constraining couples to stay committed to the marriage, at the time when personal satisfaction, or emotional attraction is lacking. In other words, the

opinion of family and friends, Biblical teaching, and the Filipino cultural view against divorce work together as constraint against the marital break up.

Questionnaire 3 assesses marital commitment that constrains divorce by the item of Social Pressure (SP) and Morality of Divorce (MD). The result of questionnaire 3 indicates that the levels of SP of both the wives and the husbands in the study are generally high. It would not be surprising if the Filipina wives would experience more social pressure than their North American husbands, given that the Philippine cultural orientation is still strong on collectivism, and familism (Jocano 1997). The opinion of family and friends is important, and one should not cause “hiya” (shame) (Lynch 1962; 1973; Bulatao 1964; and Agbayani-Siewart 2002). To the contrary, individualism is the most important American value. Each person is responsible for his or her own situation and decision in life (Althen 2003:5). Nonetheless, most of the men in this study also seem to experience the concern of their family network, at least in the issue of marriage stability.

This fact may be congruent with Orthner (1990) who proposes that Americans have not given up familism. For example, more than 53 % of adults with living parents see them at least once a month, and 51% agree that aging parents should live with children. It is noteworthy that in the personal interview, parental modeling was mentioned 13 times as an influential factor in the section on position against divorce and on the practice of sacrificial love. It can be assumed that most of the Filipina or North American participants respect their family, and their family continues to be interested in them.

The result of questionnaire 3 does not show significant differences in levels of commitment between the wives and the husbands. The mean of the wives for dedication is 6.2 and for constraint 6.1, and the husbands' is 6.3 and 6.1 for constraint. Considering the scale of 1 to 7, and 7 being the highest score, their marital commitment level is generally acceptable. However, of particular interest are couples 2, 14, and 19, because of the relatively larger difference between the partners' scores.

W2 scores 4.5 on dedication and 4.2 on constraint. Her husband has 6.1 on dedication and 5.8 on constraint. They have been married for 13 years. She is 46 years old and he is 43. They do not have children. Both of them score high on “Social Pressure” (W2: 7 and 7; H2: 7 and 6.5). In “Morality of Divorce”, W2 scores 7 and 7, while H 2 has 5.5 and 5.

The personal interview (I. Dealing with differences) manifests that for her the frequent issues are related to his spending habit and “conventionality”. For him the issues are occasionally on when to have sex. However, “conventionality” is the more prominent problem. He is also quick to ask for forgiveness and is a forgiving person. For W2 divorce is against Biblical teaching. H2 is also against divorce but he would consider divorce on case-by-case situation. This is based on Biblical teaching and common sense. However, H 2 based sacrificial love on Biblical teaching, for instance, husbands are to love their wives as Christ loves the church. For his wife, sacrificial love is reciprocity. For both of them “Social Pressure” to stay in the marriage is strong. Added to that, morality of divorce is strong for her, but for him dedication commitment is stronger in “Couple Identity” (7 and 6.5) as well as in “Satisfaction with Sacrifice” (6 and 5). W2 scores 5.5 and 4.5 on “Couple Identity”, and 3.5 and 4.5 on “Satisfaction with Sacrifice”. Added to that, asking for forgiveness and to forgive come easier to him than to her, because of Biblical teaching and his common sense. Thus, this may be their way of maintaining the marriage.

W14 has 3.1 for dedication and 2.8 for constraint commitment, whereas H14 scored 6.6 for dedication and 6.5 for constraint. W14 scored lower than her husband in Morality of Divorce (6.5 and 5). Her husband's are 7 and 7 on this item. W14 scored 4 and 2 on Couple Identity, whereas her husband 7 and 6. In Satisfaction with Sacrifice she scored 3 and 3.5. Her husband scored 6.5 and 7.

Couple 14 has been married for 15 years, they have children, ages 8 and 3, and they live in the Philippines. The personal interview (I. Dealing with Differences, table I 2) reveals that they quarrel frequently. She is the "breadwinner" in the family. As an entrepreneur, her husband likes to risk investing the money she earns, and she is tired of it. She enjoys time and money spent on food, and socializing, which is fitting in her culture. In the traditional Philippine culture, the husband is the "breadwinner", and socializing around friends and food is part of the maintaining smooth interpersonal relationship (SIR) and group spirit or togetherness ("pakikisama") (Lynch 1962; Bulatao 1963; Jocano 1969b; and Church 1986). Her husband thinks that it is a waste of time. She thinks that he is always in a rush. He considers their issues as differences in temperament. This data gathered from the personal interview allows one to understand W14 lower scores on the above-mentioned items of marital commitment. However, W14 is against divorce based on Biblical teaching. Likewise H14 is absolutely against divorce based on Biblical teaching and parental modeling (Personal Interview, table G 2).

In addition, W14 expressed that their church definitely strengthens their marriage. She said that she would have given up, if they had not received Biblical teaching. Also, many couples in their church are good role models. Her in-laws are good role models too. H14 indicated that their church deepens their faith that gives them something in common as a couple. They and their children receive the same Biblical teaching (Contribution of their church, List D II). Thus, their situation agrees with Wilson et al. (1997), and Ortega et al. (1988) on the positive influence of the common religious teaching and religious rituals for marital stability. In this case, Biblical teaching is the constraining force in their marital commitment.

In the case of Couple 19, the husband scored much lower than his wife on Morality of Divorce, Couple Identity, and Satisfaction with Sacrifice. The wife scored 7 and 7; 7 and 4; and 7 and 7 on these items. The husband scored 5.5 and 6.5; 5.5 and 3.5; and 5.5 and 5.5 on these items. This couple resides in North America. This is her first marriage and his third after having divorced twice. She married him at the age of

25.5, and he was 45.5 years old when they got married. They have been married 7.5 years and they have no children. In his personal interview, he said that they are in the process of adopting a Filipino boy. He mentioned that their frequent issue of disagreement is about money for the support of her overseas relatives. She also absolutely loves to dance anywhere. (see I. Dealing with Differences, table I 1). One might speculate, that he may be uneasy in this marriage.

However, W19 is against divorce based on her culture and parental modeling. H19 based his position on divorce and remarriage on Biblical teaching. However, he believes that divorce is permissible in specific cases. He opines that God's grace would allow for second chances after divorce (see G. Position on Divorce and Sacrificial Love).

Moreover, W19 is not comfortable in their church because of gossips and difficulty to have trusting relationships, whereas her husband is comfortable in their church. In her case the constraining force is her culture, and for him Biblical teaching may be a constraint against taking divorce lightly, but for him divorce is Biblically permitted on case-by-case situation, and remarriage is possible (God allows “recycling” program). The information from questionnaire 1 shows that he has been divorced twice.

### 3.5.2.2 Considering divorce

Questionnaire 4 confirms that at times some couples may discuss or consider divorce or separation. In questionnaire 4, H2 marked rarely (“4”) and his wife never (“5”); both W5 and H5 put rarely; W11 marked rarely but H11 occasionally; W14 occasionally but her husband rarely; W16 occasionally and H16 rarely; W17 occasionally and H17 rarely; W20 rarely but her husband never; W21 occasionally and her husband rarely.

In other words, there can be “occasionally” or “rarely” in thinking about terminating the relationship, although it does not necessarily mean that they really do it.

Booth and White (1980) report that frequency of thinking about divorce was consistently high for the first ten years of marriage, than it tapered off and remained at fairly stable level for two decades before tapering again after thirty years. Thus, the situation of these couples may not be different from the 1,364 same culture couples in Booth and White's study (1980).

Furthermore, the authors submit that the presence of young children, rather than teenagers had a corrosive influence on marital stability. The presence of young children may deter separation and divorce, but it does not keep people from thinking about it. Also, the authors found that in their sample, among the men who were “strong religious affiliates” only 6% reported thinking about divorce, while among the others 10% contemplated it. Among the women who are “strong religious affiliates” only 7% reported thinking about divorce, but 18% of the others did so.

The 8 couples mentioned earlier, have been married between 12 to 21 years. One of the couples has two children, ages 3 and 8 (Couple 14). Four others have teenage children: Couple 5 has children ages 10 and 14. Couple 11 has teenagers, 11 and 13 years old. The children of Couple 16 are 8 and 10 years. Couple 17 has 3 children between age 11 and 18. Couples 2, 20 and 21 do not have children.

Moreover, most of them do not have young children. Also, the personal interview (I. Dealing with Differences) clarifies that only Couple 17 has frequent problems about children. W17 thinks their marital disagreements are about communication, but H17 believes these are related to their 18 year old adopted “special needs” child.

None of the other couples mention children’s problems as frequent issue of disagreement. However, what is outstanding here is the couples’ age. They are all middle-aged: W2 is 46 and H2 is 43; W5 is 41 and H5 is 44; W11 is 44 and H11 is 49; W14 is 39 and H14 is 43; W16 is 40 and H16 is 40; W17 is 44 and H17 is 43; W20 is 53 and H20 is 85; and W21 is 51 and H21 is 50.

Thus, children's issues may not always be directly involved in causing the couples to think or discuss divorce and separation. The moments of the negative thinking may be related to transitional stresses of the marriage life cycle. At this juncture people tend to reevaluate their marriage relationship and life's accomplishments (Sheehy 1976; Levinson et al. 1978; Olson et al. 1989; Worthington 1989). Further discussion on the relationship between the presence of children in marriage and marital satisfaction will be presented in section 3.5.2.9 The stresses and value of having children.

Nonetheless, the personal interview (G. Position on Divorce and Sacrificial love, table G 1) reveals that all these couples maintain a position against divorce whether by Biblical conviction, or Biblical conviction combined with influences of culture, parental modeling, common sense, or personal experience. Only one husband (H20) is against divorce, based only on common sense. Thus, although these people can have moments of thinking about separation or divorce, their conviction against divorce still stands.

Moreover, the personal interview (G. Position on divorce and sacrificial love) reveals that among the 46 participants, both those that were absolutely against divorce and remarriage, and those who proposed a case by case treatment on issues of permissibility of divorce and remarriage, based their view on their understanding of Biblical teaching, or on Biblical teaching combined with elements of common sense, parental modeling, culture or experience. The persons who did not know, or have not given thought to what the Bible teaches about specific cases like adultery, abandonment, or abuse, were not sure which position to take for dealing with them.

Only two out of the 46 participants did not mention Biblical teaching as an influencing factor for their position on divorce and remarriage issues. One man mentioned common sense as his source for judgment on this issue, and one woman relied on her Filipino cultural perspective and parental modeling.

Thus, Biblical teaching is significant for the large majority of these couples' position against divorce, although they may have different views on how to deal with case-by-case situations, and in moments of frustration some may even think about divorce. In the personal interview, far more participants mention Biblical teaching as the constraining force of marital commitment than other influences to keep the marriage.

However, all the couples would not agree with persistence in an abusive marital relationship. This is a case for separation because of the danger of harm to the victim and the children. Many opine that this situation may result in divorce, if the perpetrator does not repent and change. Thus, the situation of the Evangelical Filipinas in this sample is inconsistent with what Maceda expresses concerning Filipinas' tendency to persist in unhappy or abusive marriages, because they have been socialized in Roman Catholic tradition, which prohibits divorce (Simmons 2001:136).

Furthermore, the situation on the position of divorce and remarriage among the Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas and North American Caucasian men is not uniform. There are views that support: (1) No divorce and no remarriage; (2) divorce is permissible depending on evaluation of case by case situation; (3) Where divorce is acceptable, remarriage is acceptable; (4) No divorce, but not sure what the Bible teaches on case-by-case situation.

This scenario reminds one of the diversity that is present among the Evangelicals in North America. House (1990) presents the situation of four positions:

1. No divorce and no remarriage.
2. Divorce but no remarriage.
3. Divorce and remarriage for adultery and desertion.
4. Divorce and remarriage under a variety of circumstances.

Clark (1995:31) and Clark and Rakestraw (1996:225) can be summarized as proposing two basic postures, the views of the breakability versus the unbreakability

of the marriage covenant. Evangelicals usually argue either that remarriage is always prohibited or that it is sometimes permitted. Those who are against remarriage would perceive it as adultery. The second position argues that those who are victims of divorce due to adultery, desertion, or abuse where reconciliation is not possible, can remarry. However, Evangelicals in general agree that divorce is essentially contrary to God's will, although the Bible concedes that it is sometimes necessary.

Among the Evangelical Filipina - North American Caucasian couples, despite the diversity of views on this complex topic, the desire to follow Biblical teaching rather than to ignore it is evident. There is unanimity in the position of the 46 participants of not taking divorce lightly. Some are absolutely against divorce, because of Biblical conviction. Others consider case-by-case situation for concession. Thus, the diversity in perspectives among this group corresponds to the situation among North American Evangelicals on this issue.

### 3.5.2.3 Biblical teaching of sacrificial love in marriage

The concept of marriage as a covenant is central in Biblical teaching on marriage, whereas the factor of convenience is less important in the relationship. The emphasis is on unconditional love (Anderson and Guernsey 1985; Balswick and Balswick 1991; Clark 1995). The concept of covenant differs from contract, because contracts are articulated through logic of calculative involvement and individual interest. Covenants are expressed through logic of moral involvement and unity (Bromley and Bushing 1988). In a Christian covenant marriage commitment, the partners feel that marriage is sacred (Worthington 1999:70). Both parties treat each other as "one flesh". They promise to love self-sacrificially, placing the other person's welfare at least equal to one's own well-being. Christ models the groom in relation to the church (Eph 5: 25-31) (Balswick and Balswick 1991). It can be deduced that this is an important element for personal dedication in marital commitment. Stanley and Markman (1992) explain personal dedication as the desire to maintain or to improve the quality of relationship with the partner for joint benefit. It is evidenced by the desire and the behavior to continue the relationship and to improve it, to sacrifice for

it, to invest in it, to connect it to personal goals, and not just to pursue one's own but to consider the partner's welfare.

In this regard, the Personal Interview (G. Position on Divorce and Sacrificial Love) indicates that for the majority of the participants Biblical teaching is the basis for their idea of sacrificial love. Also, combinations of Biblical teaching with parental or the modeling of other Christians, common sense, or upbringing can form the foundation for their understanding of the concept.

Among the wives, Biblical teaching is mentioned as an influencing element for the understanding of sacrificial love in marriage 19 times (82.6%), and among the husbands 20 times (86.9%).

On the other hand, 17.3% of the wives and 13% among the husbands regard sacrificial love as a matter of common sense. The lower influence of Biblical teaching on the wives' view of sacrificial love, may suggest some difference in the culture or upbringing. There are Filipino cultural values that could be confused with Biblical interpretation of sacrificial love, such as "pagtitiis" (patiently suffering or forbearance) (Bustos and Espiritu, 1996:89; Panopio and Rolda 2001:81), and "utang na loob" (reprocity) (Hollnsteiner 1964). For example, the personal interview clarifies that W2 perceives sacrificial love as reprocity. W5 considers it as parental love, and it is more based on common sense than Biblical teaching. W17 will do what would make her husband happy, if her husband insists on it. W18 understands it in the sense of her forgoing her good job in order to care for her kids, and that it is commonsense.

However, also 3 of the North American husbands conceive sacrificial love as common sense, and one learned it from his devout Roman Catholic parents.

From the scores of questionnaire 3 on Satisfaction with Sacrifice, Couple 2, 14, 17, and 19 merit some comments because of the relatively bigger difference between the

scores of the partners. W2 scores 3.5 and 4.5, and her husband 6 and 5. W14 scores 3 and 3.5, whereas her husband 6.5 and 7. W17 scores 5 and 5, and her husband 6 and 7. On the other hand, W19 scores 7 and 7, but her husband 5.5 and 5.5.

Data from Personal Interview (G. Position on Divorce and Sacrificial Love) informs that W2 understands sacrificial love as reciprocity. For her it is based on common sense, and that it is to be mutual. H2 learned this idea from Biblical teaching. He maintains that sacrificial love must not be foolish, but the Bible teaches that husbands are to love their wives as Christ loves the church. He scores higher on SS than his wife.

W14 conceives sacrificial love as unconditional love, and it is based on Biblical teaching. However, she admits that she is still struggling in its application, because of her upbringing. Now that she knows Biblical teaching, she is changing. Her husband was brought up in a devout Roman Catholic family. He is of the opinion that a person who does not get fulfillment of sacrificing for the spouse is childish and selfish. He grew up in this perspective and learned from parental modeling and Biblical teaching. In her case, she learns it from Biblical teaching. Her lower score may be related to the fact that she is still struggling and learning to practice the Biblical concept.

W17 expresses that she does not understand the concept of sacrificial love as a Biblical virtue but as common sense. She said that she would do what would make her husband happy. If it is something that is against her own will, or against her own goal, she will tell him and let him decide, whether he would still insist on it. Her attitude of self-sacrifice seems to be closer to the concept of "pagtitiis" (patient suffering or forbearance) rather than the Biblical concept of unconditional love. "Pagtitiis" is an attitude that is expressed when certain frustrating forces are too powerful to overcome. The woman sacrifices herself because it is her primary duty to care for her husband and her children (Panopio and Rolda, 2000:81).

H17 maintains that he understands sacrificial love from Biblical teaching. Christ died on the cross. Besides, he also saw this modeled in some Christians' life. This difference in the understanding of the concept may have resulted in her lower Satisfaction with Sacrifice level than his.

W19 thinks that sacrificial love is needed in marriage and that this is based on Biblical principles. She also saw the example of some Christians in this regard. She converted to the Evangelical faith 8 years ago.

H19 explains this concept as follows: “You cannot afford to do your own thing all the time, when you are married. Christ is the model. Phil 2 teaches not only to look for your own interests, but for the interest of others, just like Christ, who by his nature is God, but emptied himself out, humbled himself, took human likeness to serve.” In this case, both spouses learned this concept from Biblical teaching. The husband’s lower scores than his wife on SS, MD, and CI may not be out of lack of cognitive knowledge of Biblical teaching. He may be unaware that he is still struggling in the application, although he professed to have been an Evangelical all his life (53 years). Other data from the personal interview also reveals that he is not aware of his wife’s uneasiness in the church they attend. He feels comfortable in it (Contribution of their church, List D I, 6. 2).

In contrast, W14 (Position on divorce and Sacrificial Love, table G 2) understood sacrificial love as unconditional love. She learned it from Biblical teaching, but she realizes that she is still struggling in the practice of it, because of her upbringing. She is in the process of changing. W14 converted from nominal Roman Catholicism to the Evangelical faith 8 years ago.

There could be a difference in religiosity between these two people. H19’s situation may resonate with Booth et al. (1995) who saw a reciprocal but weak link between religion and marital quality. On the other hand, the authors underlined the significance of intrinsic religiosity for marital quality. In other words, intrinsic

religiosity would display consistency of religious orientation and its application. Also, Hughes (2001:125) reported that couples that are religiously intrinsic are generally happier in marriage and have a better marital communication than those that are religiously extrinsic, or of different faiths.

Nonetheless, the results of their adjustment scale (questionnaire 4), show that both spouses, W19 and H19, never resort to discussing termination of their relationship (item 7), they quarrel occasionally (item 8), she never regrets that she married, and he rarely does so (item 9); and they occasionally get on each other's nerves (item 10).

More specifically, in the personal interview Section A (Connecting with questionnaire 3 and 4), H19 elaborated on questionnaire 4 A: 4 (sex relations), to which he had filled out "4" (almost always agree). He explained that one of the adjustments is due to the 20 years' gap in age between him and his wife. She has more expectation than a man in his age could fulfill, but they have become more tolerant of each other, although the problem is not cured. Also, she loves to dance everywhere, even in places where he would not agree to join her, because it would be bad for his testimony.

Added to that, they have issues about financial support for her relatives. She had worked overseas in two different places, before they met through an international pen-pal club.

When he first visited her, she was not sure, if she would marry him. She felt financially responsible for her family in the Philippines. They waited for one year before they pursued the marriage. In any case, financial support for her family is an important goal for her to work overseas.

The information from the personal interview may lead to speculation that the age gap, the different interests, and the burden of supporting her relatives' financial needs might have some influence on his lower scores than his wife's on Satisfaction with Sacrifice, and Couple Identity.

Nonetheless, W19 is against divorce, because of her Philippine culture and parental modeling (see G. Position on Divorce and Sacrificial Love, table G 1). H19 believes that divorce is permitted in specific cases based on Biblical teaching and common sense. Thus, despite the conflicts, the elements of culture, social pressure and Biblical teaching may still be the factors that strengthen the couple's constraint commitment.

It can be concluded, that in the minority of the cases, the view of sacrificial love seems lacking in the spiritual dimension that Anderson and Guernsey (1985), Brombley and Bushing (1988), Balswick and Balswick (1991), Clark (1995), and Worthington (1999) suggested. It would be beneficial if the Biblical view on sacrificial love and covenant marriage were taught to couples with more clarity (see A Christian Declaration on Marriage, Nov. 14, 2000). This is true, whether one has in mind partners in the context of Filipino collectivism, or North American individualism. It would be of greater importance to clarify the common understanding of this value to intercultural couples. However, it is not sufficient to know the Biblical concept only on the cognitive level. In its practice there may be struggles. To be aware of the challenges in its application, acknowledging that one has not yet arrived, may be a sign of progress.

#### 3.5.2.4 Couple's agreement

Overall, in questionnaire 4, the couples' levels of consensus are acceptable and the spouses' scores are quite similar. Attention will be paid to the scores that indicate a relatively wider gap between the wife and the husband's responses.

On religious matters (item 1), only Couple 5 chose "2" (frequent disagreement). The personal interview explains that they were nominal Roman Catholic, and converted to the Evangelical faith 6 years ago. Prior to their conversion they had no struggles in religious matters, because they did not care about faith. Then, their problems were about the in-laws. Now the disagreements are on how to live and communicate their

new faith, because they are concerned about practicing what the Bible teaches. It seems that they are in a transition process in matters of faith. It may be understood as a crisis with the potential for growth, when there is adequate teaching and spiritual support, which they are eager to pursue.

Couple 14, has relatively lower scores on marital satisfaction, but in religious matters it is quite united (W14: almost always agree, and H14: always agree).

On the other hand, Couple 14 and Couple 17 seem to be quite united in religious matters, but have frequent disagreements (“2”) about demonstration of affection. However, in their personal interview Couple 14 did not mention demonstration of affection as an issue. Their problems were related to the cultural values of money, food and the use of time, and on personality. She is tired of being the "breadwinner". W17 talked about communication problems and H17 about the marital stresses due to their adopted child that has special needs. The couples may have both issues on demonstration of affection and the other problems, but they had more freedom to express their most serious concern in the personal interview than in the limited items in the questionnaire. The similarity in religious matters may still be a positive element for unity even with the frequent disagreements on the other issues.

In the personal interview Couple 2, mentioned disagreements on "conventionality" regarding demonstration of affection and sex. W2's complaint was about her husband way of showing affection publicly, which to her is shameful. H2 also mentioned that they have occasional disagreements on when to have sex. Couple 2 marked "3" (occasional disagreement) on the item of demonstration of affection in questionnaire 4. W2 almost always agrees on religious matters, and H2 occasionally disagrees on it. They are both against divorce based on Biblical teaching, and on common sense when it comes to the case-by-case situation.

W11 mentioned that they have issues related to sexual relation and emotional needs. She tends to like more touching and expressions of affection, because she is

expressive and he is not. However, he did not mention this problem. He said that they have issues on priorities. In questionnaire 4, W11 marked the item for demonstration of affection "3" (occasional disagreement) and H11 marked it "4" (almost always agree). Likewise, for sexual relations, she marked "3" (occasional disagreement), and he almost always agree ("4"). For him the sexual issue may not be as important, or he is less aware of it than she is. On religious matters she almost always agrees, and he occasionally disagrees. However, the personal interview indicates that they both take a "no divorce" position. She based this on Biblical teaching, her Filipino culture, and parents' modeling. He based his position on Biblical teaching.

#### 3.5.2.5 Conventuality

The topic of disagreement in perspective concerning proper or improper behavior called "conventuality" is mentioned often as an issue of disagreement between spouses in the personal interview (I. Dealing with Differences). However, the specific circumstances are not readily apparent from the scores of item 5 in questionnaire 4.

In the personal interview Couple 1 deals with "conventuality" issues because she practices the Filipino SIR (smooth interpersonal relationship). However, her husband thinks that their "conventuality" issues are 80% based on male vs. female perspectives. The couple has been married for 12 years.

For W2, her husband's spending habit, his showing affection openly, and his frankness is contrary to her perspective of proper behavior in public. H2 agrees that "conventuality" often causes frictions. They have been married 13 years.

Couple 3 has a problem of "conventuality" regarding rules of behavior for their children. They have been married 15 years.

Similarly, W 6 has differences of perspective concerning proper behavior for their children, but H6 believes that the discord is frequently about the different spending priorities. They have been married 28 years.

W10 considers her husband as too frank, but H10 presents prioritizing time and planning as the frequent item of disagreement. They have been married for 11 years.

H19 believes that as a couple they have “conventionality” issues in that, she absolutely loves dancing anywhere. He thinks that it is inappropriate. They also have issues on financial support for her relatives. W19 thinks that their frequent arguments are about cleanliness. He is very organized. They have been married 7.5 years.

W13 thinks that her husband is too direct, but she is more concerned with how others feel. H13 believes that the issue is that she thinks culturally, but he thinks Biblically. They have been married 15.5 years.

W15 thinks that they have differences on cultural priorities regarding the value of food as enjoyment. Her husband believes that their issues are due to “conventionality” associated with differences of personalities and the way they were raised. They have been married 10 years.

W18 perceives issues of “conventionality” related to her smooth interpersonal style. Her husband is unhappy with her indirectness. However, H18 thinks that their issues are about time management. They have been married 19 years.

Couple 22 has issues of “conventionality” regarding children’s manners. They have been married 7.25 years.

Thus, the “conventionality” issues are mostly related to the intercultural situation. The wives tend to be more aware of the cultural differences than the husbands. Considering the length of time of the marriage, for most of them “conventionality”

may be the gap that will never be bridged (Mc Goldrick and Prieto 1984:362), which they must acknowledge, accept, and deal with attitude of flexibility and forgiveness (see I. Dealing with Differences). This may be items for a lifelong process of adjustment that requires marital commitment that Crohn (1995) and Romano (2001) mention. Nonetheless, for these couples the issues have not hindered their marital commitment.

#### 3.5.2.6 Quarrels and reconciliation

According to questionnaire 4, most of these couples quarrel occasionally or rarely, but Couple 14 quarrels most of the time; Couple 16 quarrels more often than not; W17 indicated that they quarrel more often than not, while her husband marked "occasionally".

The personal interview (I. Dealing with Differences) indicates that Couple 14 experiences a lot of stresses in their marriage. She is tired of being the "breadwinner" with him investing her money on enterprises she views as risky. She also enjoys spending money and time on food and socializing that he does not appreciate. They have personality and cultural differences. Like most of the Filipinas in the sample, she would give him a "silent treatment". He is the one who initiates talking out the problem. He is quicker to apologize. For her, acknowledging mistakes and apologizing is not easy because of her culture. For him, apologizing is based on Biblical teaching, common sense to remove impasse, and his parents modeled it. She recognizes that she is learning to apologize from his modeling. They seem to cope well with this dynamics.

For couple 16, the frequent quarrels are about money for support of her extended family. For her it is an important cultural value. He sees it as her relatives overstepping financial boundaries. When she is upset, she refuses to talk. When he is upset he may say harsh words. When they do not get anywhere, they take "time out" to cool down. After that, he would initiate "talking out" the issue with her until an agreement is reached. He apologizes first. This is because he remembers Biblical

teaching about not to let the sun go down on your anger. For her apologizing is hard. She thinks that this behavior is because of her pride, her cultural tendency to avoid losing face, and her father's modeling. Her father never apologized.

W17 thinks that they have communication problems. H17 believes that their quarrels have to do with the stresses of dealing with their adopted teenager, who is a "special needs" child. This is an exceptional case where when the wife is upset, she yells. Most of the Filipina wives in the sample resort to silence when they are upset. On the other hand, her husband withdraws to silence. She is also the one to initiate talking over the issue. She apologizes, because she has learned it from Biblical teaching. Also, he apologizes in order to resolve a conflict, even when he does not think he is wrong. In his case it is because of common sense (see I. Dealing with Differences, table I 2)

Among the 23 couples interviewed, many of the frequent issue for disagreement are associated with differences in cultural perspectives. Ten of the 16 wives of the couples that reside in North America are conscious of the cultural nature of the problems, but only 4 of the husbands recognize them as such. Five of the 7 wives who live in the Philippines know that their issue has to do with the cultural difference, but only 1 husband realizes it. In other words, the wives are more alert to cultural differences than the husbands. Thus, the wives are in general more conscious of cultural adjustment than the husbands, even among the couples that live in the Philippines.

Jones and Chao (1997:170) believe that the critical factors in the development of a healthy intercultural relationship are: (1) Conscious awareness by both partners of the role of culture in the relationship; (2) the ability by both partners to experience ethnic and cultural energies as an expansion rather than as a threat to self; and the ability of both partners to develop their own uniqueness. No precarious risk of prejudice is sensed among the sample as far as the spouses' view about each other's

culture is concerned. In some cases there is a certain lack of awareness of the role of culture in the relationship, especially among the husbands.

Most of the cultural difference involves the value of "SIR" (Smooth Interpersonal Relationship) and "Pakikisama" (group spirit or togetherness) (Lynch, 1962).

Another, cultural point of contention is the issue of financial support for the wife's extended family. Four couples that live in North America are still dealing with this recurrent issue. On the other hand, another two couples in North America do not consider this issue as a problem. With these two couples, the husbands consider supporting their wife's extended family as an act of generosity.

The couples have various ways in dealing with the issue. One wife turns over money management to her husband to avoid her relatives from approaching her for support (F. Leadership in Their Home). One husband sold a property he inherited in North America, and uses the money to set up a business for his wife's relatives in the Philippines. In this case, it did not cure the problem but reduced it. The others quarrel, come to an agreement, pray together, count their money, and decide how much money to send to the relatives now, and how much later (see I. Dealing with Differences).

Surprisingly, only one of the seven couples that live in the Philippines mentions this problem. However the husband of this one said that they have solved it when they moved to another island far from the in-laws, and by letting them know that they are unable to provide jobs and support for them as expected. Unfortunately, the relationship with her relatives turned cold.

Thus, adjustment may be a struggle and it may involve quarrels. This is congruent with Gottman (1994:23) who wrote that much more important than having compatible views is how couples work out their differences.

The personal interview shows the importance of at least one partner having learned to ask forgiveness from Biblical teaching. In this regard, cultural hindrance for one partner to acknowledge mistakes or to apologize can be overcome by the other partner's willingness to initiate the reconciliation. Thus, the cultural value of "amor propio" (sense of personal dignity or pride) (Church 1986; Jocano 1997) to protect one's image can be met with Biblical teaching on reconciliation (see Personal Interview, I. Dealing with Differences).

Still, it is not to be overlooked that marital adjustment, whether in intercultural or intra-cultural marriages, is a lifelong process. This is even more so in intercultural marriages. It takes commitment (Crohn 1995; Romano 2001). There may also be adjustment gaps that will never be bridged, and these must be acknowledged too (Mc Goldrick and Prieto 1984:362). The personal interview (I. Dealing with Difference) agrees with this reality. Nonetheless, it also testifies that these couples are still committed to their marriage and to deal with the differences. More importantly, with all couples at least one of the spouses is flexible to initiate reconciliation and to apologize after an argument.

#### 3.5.2.7 Gender-role and Biblical teaching

The personal interview shed light on gender-role issues that were not addressed in questionnaires 3 and 4. Adjustment of gender-role of husband and wife is a relevant issue for marital satisfaction and stability. This topic may even be more salient in the context of intercultural marriage, where partners' role expectations are influenced by cultural backgrounds. Imamura (1986b) states that international marriage data are particularly useful, because differences in role expectation in the spouses' societies are often more readily apparent than in intranational marriages. She also underlines that mutual understanding and adjustment of role expectation is likely to be relevant for the success of the marriage (Imamura 1986b:46). Moreover, Andrew Jones (2001) found that within-group mismatch of gender attitude leads to individuals seeking partners across racial and national lines.

The results of the personal interviews (F. Leadership in Their Home) reflect a scene that approximates Howell's position (1979) of the "equality and submission" or "continuum" model between the patriarchal/traditional model and the equality/partnership model (see 2.3.3.3. The continuum model). Overall, the couples base their view on gender-role on their interpretation of Biblical teaching. Although the majority believes that the husband should have the leadership role, in their task distribution in the home they maintain a flexible posture that is mostly based on common sense. Thus, especially in its application, their gender-role expresses more of what Howell sees as blending styles.

Howell (1979) submits that parental models, personality and temperament characteristics, religious teachings, and personal experience often influence how couples form their relationship. He warns about the danger of justifying relationship style based on personality needs using theological arguments (Howell 1979:128).

There is no indication of the last mentioned precarious situation in the data gathered, but the elements of Biblical teaching, parental models, personality, temperament, and personal experience did surface as significant factors in this study.

Also, Howell's idea that there is a possibility for role style change from one model to another is evidenced in several cases in this study, where the wives are in the process of turning over the leadership role to their husbands in obedience to Biblical teaching they have newly assimilated. Added to that, Howell (1979) proposes that giving up one style for another cannot be done suddenly and drastically, and one partner may not change as rapidly as the other. In this regard, the couples in the sample that are in the process of making the change, seem to have the wisdom to recognize the need for a transition, rather than the making an abrupt change (Note couple: 1, 11, 13, 14, 16, in F. Leadership in Their Home).

Further, the "continuum" features that appear in the couples' gender-role adjustment may be a by-product of the "double-layer" gender-role practices in the Philippine

culture. The Philippine culture is matriarchal in its Malay root and patriarchal by the influence of the Spanish colonization, so that gender-role in the Philippine culture may be matriarchal on the inside but patriarchal on the surface (Hart 1980; Andres 1987; Medina 1991; and Zaide 1998). Go (1993) assert that several features of the Filipino cultural values persist into the 1990s. These are for instance, interdependence and reciprocal indebtedness, familism, hierarchy of generational respect, and husband and wife egalitarian role, combined with division of domain in decision making. Also, Agbayani-Siewart and Revilla (1995:169) confirm that family authority among the Filipinos is not patriarchal but more egalitarian. Husband and wife share equally in financial and family decisions.

In addition to the "double-layer" gender-role practices, following the conversion to the Evangelical faith, the Filipina wives turn to Biblical teaching for direction on the role of husband and wife.

The personal interview (F. Leadership in their home) pictures three types of patterns:

1. There are couples where the wife's Filipino cultural gender-role practices are apparent and the women are conscious of it (e.g. Couple 8, and Couple 12).
2. There are couples of which the wives are in the process of turning leadership of the home to the husband due to Biblical teaching (e.g. W1, W7, W9, W11, W12, W23, W13, W14, W16, W17, W18, W22, W23). The transition is particularly clarified in the interview by W1, W11, W13, W14, and W16.
3. The third group is where the wives are unaware that they are still functioning according to their cultural gender-role system, but they may think that as a couple they are exercising gender-role based on Biblical teaching, common sense, personality or parental modeling (e.g. W5, W3, W10).

It can be concluded, that most couples seek Biblical teaching for their gender-role practices in the home, but that gender-role functioning among this group of intercultural couples cannot be specified as "traditional" or "egalitarian" model according to the North American Evangelical gender-role debate. They function more

on a "continuum" model (Howell 1979). They did not intentionally choose to enter into a gender-role controversy. They have a unique adjusted model, that is more in line with the finding of Hunt and Coller (1957), that the intercultural couples tend to arrive at their own unique modified culture that does not entirely fit either of their culture of origin. For Falicov (1995:237-245) and Jones and Chao (1997:170), it would be their goal for counseling to help intercultural couples develop a "new culture" that is more uniquely theirs. Added to that, the couples in this study experienced the influence of the theological orientation on gender-role they received.

Moreover, Samonte (Simmons 2001:188) suggests that feminism, as a movement has not entered into the Philippine situation. The study shows that the division of tasks in the couples' home at times may resemble egalitarianism. However, this practice does not stem from feminism's ideas, but from the Filipino matriarchal cultural roots, and from practical common sense.

Beside the influence of Biblical teaching, the husbands may have gravitated more toward the flexible modern North American role sharing trends (Browning et al. 1997). Browning et al. (1997) found that the North American couples they interviewed were more flexible than their parents, although wives today are still more tied to domestic responsibilities than the husbands. For examples, North American couples today perceive that their mothers were much more inclined to see their role at the home than in the new generation. The modern couple shares access to bank account and checkbooks more than their mother did. Couples today share more completely the raising and disciplining of children than did their parents.

Furthermore, Tseng (1977:102-103) submits that people who marry interculturally need to have a higher tolerance for confusion, sense of acceptance of areas of dissatisfaction, and acknowledgement of how to appropriately change their attitude according to the situations. Presumably, most of these couples have sufficient tolerance and flexibility for maintaining their marriage this far.

Moreover, many of the Filipinas in the study work outside the home. Also, considering how the spouses met, and how they decided to marry, both the husbands and the wives seem to be people who are willing to overstep the boundaries of the conventional. It may very well be that in this case, both sides are willing to find a middle ground rather than dealing with a "mismatch" of gender attitudes in their original cultures as Jones mentioned (Jones 2001). Thus, in their gender-role adjustment, Biblical interpretation on leadership in the home is combined with practical common sense in the day-to-day functioning of the roles.

#### 3.5.2.8 Adjustment to in-laws

The majority of the couples continue maintaining ties with relatives in the homeland, or in-laws overseas (How they met, B II). All wives, except one, visit their relatives in the Philippines. The one that does not visit did not have a close relationship with her family even before her marriage. All the women visit their in-laws in North America often.

In contrast, four of the husbands who live in North America have not visited the in-laws in the Philippines. It may suggest that more wives are adept to honoring both sides of the family than the husbands. This is congruent with the Filipino bilateral kinship system. Hart (1980:774) stresses three features of the Philippine kinship system: bilateral, generational hierarchy, and respect for seniority. Also, in general the fact that these couples married interculturally, has not broken their relationship with their family.

Yet there can be a downside of close family ties. Relationship with the in-law may have a positive affect on social pressure against divorce (questionnaire 3), but they can also be an intrusion to the marriage. As mentioned earlier, the Filipino family system is markedly bilateral and with closely knit extended family ties (Hart 1980, Church 1986). For this reason, it is a common understanding in the Philippine culture that when one marries, it is a marriage into a family, rather than just to the individual.

Romano (2001:97-102) writes that couples in an intercultural marriage not only get a set of foreign in-laws; but that they may also wed a totally absorbing concept of family, which will have a great bearing on how they live their marriage lives. She submits that these intercultural differences make for quite diverse interpretations on how to handle and relate to in-laws.

Medina (1995:178-179) attributed problems with in-laws as the most frequent issue encountered in research on Filipino marital adjustment because of the closely-knit extended family system and extreme loyalty to family of origin. Also, complications can arise when the in-laws consciously or unconsciously manipulate or control the lives of their children and grandchildren. Lapuz (1977:50) mentions that family solidarity and a closely-knit extended family system are salient source for problems with in-laws, even though the purpose of the close family ties are for providing material and emotional security.

The result of this study is somewhat distinct from the findings of Medina (1995), and Lapuz (1977), because of the additional intercultural feature of the marriage, and because in some cases the in-laws have a different faith. Nevertheless, in-law relationship and intrusion have not been the most frequent problem of adjustment in the marriages of Evangelical Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands.

Most of the couples that live in North America (62.5%) feel accepted by in-laws on both sides, although with one couple the acceptance was not immediately. Two wives (12.5%) experience their relationship with their in-laws as cold, but their husbands feel accepted by their Filipino in-laws. On the other hand, with one other couple, the wife feels accepted by her North American in-laws, but her husband's relationship with her family is cold. The reason for not feeling accepted varied. Only in one man's case it was due to initial racial prejudice. In the case of one wife, her mother in-law initially suspected that she married to get a passage to North America.

Another reason was because of marrying out of the Roman Catholic faith, when the in-law was Roman Catholic. Also factors were the in-laws' personality, and personal experiences that led to the initial prejudice, or the family-in-law was not closely-knit to begin with. Overall, there has been progress toward acceptance by the in-laws, especially because of their love for the grandchildren.

Among the couples that live in the Philippines, 85.7% of the wives feel accepted by their North American in-laws. Only in one case, the wife (W18) felt that her mother-in-law initially suspected that she married her son to get a passage to North America, but the prejudice was quickly corrected after they got acquainted.

However, 4 of the 7 husbands (57.1%) do not have a close relationship with their Philippine in-laws. The reasons for the lack of warmth in the relationship vary: the personality of the in-laws, language and cultural barrier, the difference in religion, and the fact that the family of the wife was not closely-knit.

It appears that more wives are able to fit in with their in-laws than the husbands. The wives that experience a cold relationship with the in-law in North America or in the Philippines do not mention language and cultural barrier as the reason, rather initial prejudice on the part of the in-law. As reasons for their cold relationship with the in-laws, the husbands mentioned for instance: higher expected qualification by the in-law for marrying the wife; a controlling mother-in-law, financial support for relatives, the in-laws' disapproval of their young age for marriage; and language and cultural barriers.

The Filipina wives' easier adjustment may be partly due to their English language ability, and the practice the Filipino smooth interpersonal relationship style (Lynch 1962; and Church 1986). Also, they are more adept to Filipino familism and the bilateral kinship system (Hart 1980; and Jocano 1997). One wife (W2) candidly expresses in her personal interview, that she has no problems dealing with her in-laws, because as a Filipina, she knows how to maintain smooth relationships.

It is noteworthy that most of the couples have either developed ways to cope with the issue of intrusion of in-laws, or they do not sense an intrusion. The majority of those living in North America do not perceive intrusions from in-laws. Where there is a possible intrusion, the spouses maintain a united front as a couple based on Gen 2:24. In one case where there was a period of intrusion by the husband's mother in matters of child discipline, the husband took his wife's side. In another case, when the wife's family intruded, the husband talked to his wife and had her deal with the problem.

Issues of financial support for the Philippine in-laws may also be considered as "intrusions" by the husband, whereas for the Philippine culture it is an accepted practice that the more well-to-do member of the family supports the others. This is part of debt of gratitude (*utang na loob*) of a person toward the parents and siblings (Hollnsteiner 1964).

Thus, the personality of the individual and that of the in-law, the difference in faith, the situation of the family of origin of the spouse, financial support for the wives' family, and language barrier may hinder the in-law relationship. The spouses' commitment helps to keep out in-laws' intrusion, by keeping a united front.

For intercultural marriages, the Biblical teaching of "leaving parents" and "cleaving to spouse" of Gen 2:24 is more emphatic. Although loyalty to family and honoring parents are still a strong Philippine value for these couples, many are able to put loyalty to their spouse first, by maintaining a united front.

Still, it would serve well to remember that attitudes' changes toward the differences might not only be in the relationship with in-laws. The favorable changes in perspectives may involve the spouses, the in-laws, and the surrounding network, in order to help strengthen the couples' marital stability and satisfaction (Cottrell 1990; Prinzing and Prinzing 1991; Johnson and Warren 1994; Chan and Smith 1995).

### 3.5.2.9 The stresses and the value of having children

The personal interviews show that 4 of the couples had differences related to the presence of children. However, the results of questionnaire 4 on the score of “Satisfaction” may not always relate to the increased marital stresses and decreased marital satisfaction associated with the presence of young, school age or adolescent children.

Among the couples with young children, Couple 14, and Couple 16 have relatively lower scores on Satisfaction than other couples. However, in their personal interviews, the couples did not mention children's issue as their frequent differences (I. Dealing with Differences). For Couple 14, the issues of frequent disagreements are values on finances, time, food and personality. As to Couple 16, their issue of marital stresses is about money for the support of her extended family.

On the other hand, the personal interview discloses that Couples 3, 6, 17 and 22 have differences related to raising children. Couple 3 has problems on values for disciplining their children. With couple 6, the wife indicates that their issues are about the style of raising their children, because her perspective is based on her culture. However, H6 does not mention children's' issues. Instead, he complains about their different priority in spending money.

Couple 17 has teenage children. H17 mention that the emotional problem of their child is largely the stressor in their marriage. Also, Couple 22 manifests the frequent issues associated with raising children.

The personal interview shows that the last mentioned four couples have frequent arguments on children's issues, but their scores on Satisfaction in questionnaire 4 are higher than those of the previous two couples who do not have children issues. Thus, the differences in cultural perspective between the wife and the husband concerning raising children create frequent couple's disagreements, but there may be worse issues that can decrease marital satisfaction than marital stresses over children.

With regard to childlessness, it appears that the childless couples have somehow accepted their circumstance, or have other ways of filling the void of parenthood. The Satisfaction's scores of childless Couple 2, Couple 12, Couple 19, Couple 20 and Couple 21 do not differ much from couples who have children. However, W20 and W21 scored much lower than their husbands on this subscale.

W20 was married at the age of 33 and her husband at the age of 65. He was a widower with two adult children. W21 was married at the age of 39. Her husband was 44 years old then. Presumably expectation for having children may not be an issue from the beginning. Both women reveal in their personal interview that their marital discords are frequently on their cultural value of the importance for supporting their family financially. It may be that the cultural view of the importance of maintaining close ties with the family is even more pronounced here, because these women do not have children. In the Filipino culture, children are the provision of security for one's old age (Andres 1987; Andres and Andres 1987; Matthews 1994; Panopio and Rolda 2000).

Couple 2 have tried to have children but remained childless. They have accepted the condition. She works in childcare to meet that need. Couple 12 acknowledges that they married late. She was 40 and he was 39 when they married. She has had several miscarriages. They believe that happiness does not depend on how many children they have.

Lastly, W19 married when she was 25.5 years and her husband married her at the age of 45.5 years. It was his 3rd marriage after having been divorced twice. She says that how many children one has, depends on God's provision. He mentions that they are in the process of adopting a Filipino boy (H. Perspective on Having Children).

It is worth mentioning that all 23 couples in the study no longer follow the traditional Filipino appreciation for big families. Andres (1987:27–31) mentions the importance

of children. Children are “gifts of God. They bring happiness to parents, siblings and other relatives. Children are economic assets and investments for old age. They are public evidences of maleness and fulfillment of motherhood. They are evidences of love and a strengthening force in marriage and family. Children (sons) continue the family name. Children can enhance the parental prestige.

Matthews (1994) argues that children play a central and symbolic role in kinship and “compadrazgo” (extended family network). Filipinos establish, maintain and affirm their notions of personhood and identity by means of having children. The author suspects that the Philippine traditional outlook on the value of children may be the hindrance to family planning programs in the Philippines.

On the other hand, North Americans have a mixed or ambivalent opinion about the value of children. They know that having children is a great responsibility. It entails work, inconvenience and expense. The nuclear family system predominates in North American society. Each couple must be responsible for the care of their children, whereas in the Filipino culture, couples can count on their extended family support system (Althen 2003:13–14).

The personal interviews (H. Perspective on Having Children) indicate that except in four cases where circumstances were the decisive factors for the size of the family, the guiding principle for deciding on how many children to have was not culture but common sense. Also, the spouses agreed together on the issue. The basic philosophy approximates more the North American perspective than the traditional Philippine view. Thus, the Filipina wives have adjusted to more modern attitudes in this regard. Childlessness was a circumstance accepted as ultimately God’s will, and that it should not be a hindrance to marital happiness.

### **3.5.3 The influence of church participation on marital commitment and adjustment**

#### 3.5.3.1 Church attendance

The result of questionnaire 2 indicates that all of the couples regularly attend church. The wives attend an average of 3.5, and the husbands an average of 3.6 Sunday worship service per month. In the cases where the wife or the husband was absent from Sunday services, the reason was due to work schedule, to responsibility of teaching a Sunday school class in church, or ill health, but to be absent was against their desire. It is worth mentioning that not only the wives, but also the husbands of these Evangelical intercultural couples are religious. This is contrary to the study of Hunt and Coller (1957:228). They reported that the matter of religious practices were relatively easy to reconcile between the Filipina wives and the American husbands. In both cultures religion was more for the women. Also, literature on Filipina intercultural marriages has only mentioned the Filipinas' religiosity.

Table Q2 shows that all spouses jointly attend church Sunday service at least one Sunday per month. In addition they have various types of church activities that they regularly attend separately or jointly with their spouse.

As previously mentioned, Wilson et al. (1997) suggest that frequent church attendance strengthens exposure to certain religious orientation. Call and Heaton (1997) found that the frequency of religious attendance has a positive impact on marital stability. When both spouses attend church regularly, the couple has the lowest risk of divorce. To the contrary, when spouses differ in church attendance, the risk of marital dissolution increases. Where one spouse attends church regularly, while the other never attends church, the likelihood for divorce is higher than when both spouses do not attend church at all.

Robinson (1994) submits that religious orientation enhances marital communication. Moreover, her subjects described ways, in which faith or religious orientation had

provided support in their relationship through good and bad times. The support they experienced from their faith or religious orientation can be categorized as social, emotional, or spiritual. Also, their faith provided them with moral guidance, facilitated decision-making, and it had minimized conflict within their marriage. Clearly articulated is that religious faith served as a means for guidance in dealing with decisions and conflicts. However, Booth et al. (1995) underline the significance of intrinsic religious faith and church participation for marital happiness, rather than the significance of religiosity. They maintain that religion and marital quality have a reciprocal but weak connection.

Nevertheless, like-mindedness in religious orientation among spouses, regular church attendance and shared church activities tend to have a positive impact on marriages (Quinn 1984; Larson and Goltz 1989; Robinson 1994; Wilson and Musick 1996; Call and Heaton 1997). This is confirmed in the personal interview (D. The Contribution of their Church to the Well-being of their Marriage).

While merely attending church was not generally mentioned as fostering marital commitment and stability, involvement and joint participation in church activities were contributive to marital well-being.

Furthermore, the Personal Interview (C. Expectation for Choice of Church) discloses that for the Evangelical Filipina – North American Caucasian couples there are personal preferences for choosing to participate in a church. However, neither the size of the church, nor the ethnicity of the church members are ultimately the basic concern for their decision to join.

The main criteria for their choice are: a church community where they can feel belonging and rooted; a community that is like extended family; a church with good Biblical teaching and practices, where they can grow spiritually; a church that ministers to their whole family, especially for their children and teenagers. This

church is to be one where they experience good fellowship, and have their circle of friends.

Although 13% of the men would like to be able to contribute with their spiritual gifts, for 26 % of the women, having that opportunity is important. This criterion of preference for the women may agree with Swindoll (1995:340-346). He proposes six vital signs of a healthy church. He believes that one of these is the "emphasis on individual dignity and mutual variety" based on 1 Cor 12:14-20. The acknowledgement and opportunity for the members of the body of Christ to contribute with their unique gifts for the well-being of the body, is a way of emphasizing individual dignity and mutual variety in a church.

The Filipina wives in the study seem to feel accepted in the church where their unique gifts are recognized and appreciated, and where they can contribute to the body of believers. Thus, such opportunity affirms their dignity as part of the congregation, despite their distinct background or intercultural marriage.

Also, language and cultural barriers, rather than racial barriers can hinder a wife or a husband's participation in a "White" or a Filipino church. The situation among the sample may be less drastic than in the case of Black and White marriages described in Prinzing and Prinzing (1991). Moreover, for the wives (60 %) feeling belonging, rooted, and like extended family, proves to be much more significant than for the husbands (39 %). For the wives, Philippine collectivism and familism mentioned earlier may be a relevant factor.

Heinonen's research (1996) on Filipino immigrants in Canada, reports that church activities and belonging to a church family are important factors for their well-being. A woman in Heinonen's study claimed that the church played a very important role in maintaining the family's spiritual, emotional, social, and even physical health. Foundational was the emphasis on social connection and expression of common

Filipino cultural identity, including, beliefs, values and practices. The study was not on intercultural families.

Similarly, Samonte (1992), and Beer (1996) found in their study on Filipinas married to Europeans, that Filipinas tend to seek out their compatriots for social support. Religiosity and church attendance have also been reported as facilitating social and spiritual support, that is beneficial in dealing with the stresses of their intercultural marriage and living overseas.

The study of Heinonen (1996) is on Filipino immigrant families in Canada. Samonte (1992), and Beer (1996) deal with intercultural marriage between Filipinas and Dutch and Germans. The Filipinas in these studies are Roman Catholic.

In the present study, the sample consists of Evangelical Filipinas married to Evangelical North American Caucasian husbands. To them, their Evangelical church is their extended family and social network, where the need for a common Evangelical Christian identity as an intercultural couple can be met.

This expectation is not far from Berkhof's argument (1974:396). He proposes that most communions and corporations we know are, for instance, based on oneness of blood, of interests, or of purpose. However, the Christian communion must prove its distinctiveness by going beyond all these boundaries. It should get all people involved in it, including those who are excluded by other communions. Although the couples are not necessarily excluded from their cultural, social and religious background, many of them left their original cultural and religious background to enter their intercultural and Evangelical context.

On the other hand, the husbands (39.1%) are less concerned about the aspects of feeling belonging, rooted and like being part of an extended family than the wives (60.8%). They seem to be more emphatic about the criteria of good Biblical teaching and practices, and the nourishment for spiritual growth (husbands 56.5% vs. wives

39.15%). Still, where there are options to choose from, the majority of the couples are sufficiently flexible and willing to attend the church where they can both feel comfortable as a couple. Among those who live in North America 31.5 % attend a Filipino church, 25 % are in a multicultural church, and 43.7 % are members in a "White" church.

### 3.5.3.2 The benefits from church participation

The personal interview (D. The Contribution of their Church to the Well-being of their Marriage) lists ample positive influences of church participation on the couples' marital commitment and adjustment, for instance: a sense of belonging and rootedness, a sense of extended family, Biblical teaching, counsel on marriage and family matters, praying for one another, role-models for marriage life, holding one another accountable, common friends, being accepted as a unit, being involved together as a family, and having a common bond and a common focus.

As mentioned earlier, Tseng (1977:102–103) underlines that for intercultural couples, it is most important that they have a common goal toward which they are strongly motivated. The church participation of these couples seems to nurture that common goal.

Two of the husbands pointedly said that their church provides stability to their marriage through teaching and role models. Another two men perceived common Biblical teaching, common faith, the role model of couple and family life in the church as strengthening their marriage.

Also, two wives testified of the significance of participation in a Bible study or small group of the church as benefiting their marriage. Couple 14 has many challenges in married life, but W14 admits that she would have given up, if she had not received Biblical teaching in their church. The instruction helps her learn to obey God. There are role models in church that she did not have in her background. The church also holds them accountable as a couple.

One other wife explained that the Bible study teaches to sacrifice and to serve one another. Before she used to think that marriage was 50 – 50. If someone is unhappy in marriage, divorce is acceptable. Now that she has learned to submit to her husband, she feels more relaxed.

Thus, it appeared that the finding of studies on North American intra-culture marriages of Wilson et al. (1997), and Call and Heaton (1997) are in agreement with the situation of the Filipina-North American Caucasian Evangelical marriages. Frequency of church attendance increased exposure to like-minded people, and reinforced the same family values they hold (Wilson et al. 1997). Frequency of church attendance had the greatest positive impact on marital stability when both spouses attended church regularly (Call and Heaton 1997).

Furthermore, in the study of Evangelical Filipina-North American Caucasian couples, where church participation did not provide the couples with spiritual nourishment, mutual care and fellowship, such church participation did not benefit the marriage. However, further clarification is in order. It is not all the fault of the church, which causes some couples not to benefit from church participation.

Among the wives, who are living in North America, 37.5 % do not experience benefits from their church participation for the well-being of their marriage, but only 12.5 % of the husbands do not do so. In contrast, among the couples that live in the Philippines 14.2 % of the wives do not perceive the contribution of the church to their marriage. Of the husbands 14.2 % said that there is both good and bad in being involved in their church. Another 14.2% clearly express that they do not experience benefit from their church participation.

The reasons the wives that live in North America do not feel their church ministers to the well-being of their marriage are: 1. The husband's work schedule prevents the couple from attending couples' group in their church. 2. Their church focuses on

“seekers” and has grown too big. 3. She does not know enough English to get anything out of the church services and from having close friends in church (The church is a “White” church, where her husband grew up, and all his family attend, so that he is comfortable there, and they stay). 4. The couple is busy serving, but do not get ministered to. 5. She complains of gossips and lack of trust in the church. 6. The church focuses too much on social and political issues, so that she does not receive Biblical teaching on marriage there.

Two of the husbands echo their wives. They also do not perceive a contribution of their church for the well being of the marriage because their church is focused on “seekers.” The other one expresses that they are too occupied with serving the church to receive nurture for their own marriage.

One wife, who lives in the Philippines, does not see a benefit from their church participation for the well-being of their marriage, because their work schedule prevents them from being involved in the church. They do not have close friends in their church. Her husband also does not experience benefits from their church for their marriage, because he has difficulty in mixing with people he does not know. He does not feel spiritually fed in his church. He does not experience good fellowship there.

Thus, the majority of the hindrances from receiving benefits from church participation are not related to the fact that they are intercultural couples, except in the case of one woman who has difficulty with the language, and another one who complains of gossips in their church. Moreover, there can be hindrances in church participation because of a person’s work schedule (Couple 2, Couple 17). With couple 19, the wife cannot have trusting relationships but the husband feels comfortable in the church.

Furthermore, even though these couples have indicated that they do not sense benefits for their marriage from their church participation, it is not yet possible to pinpoint how this has negatively affected their marriage. This may be an item for further study.

The brighter side is that several of the couples that feel that their church is no longer well suited for them, are thinking of finding better options (Couple 5, 8, and 12), or to change their time commitment (Couple 2, and 18). For two other couples, there are in fact some reasons for being in their church. They came to join the church because their children and youth have a good group there (Couple 3, and 17). Couple 20 joined their church because it is multicultural.

On the other hand, it is a great challenge when one of the spouses feels comfortable and receives benefits from participating in their church, but the other spouse does not (Couple 8, and 19), so that the couple persists in an unbalanced situation.

Thus, it is often the couples themselves that must find ways to overcome many of these pitfalls. Still, churches need to be aware that focusing too much on ministering to “seekers” and to grow in size, or to overemphasize social and political issues, can undermine the ministry to couples in the congregation. Although giving the opportunity for members to exercise their gifts is beneficial, overloading certain members with responsibilities can be detrimental for the marriage, and member care must include mutual care, counseling and holding people accountable.

Receiving common Biblical teaching and being jointly involved in church activities and friendships are positive influences for marital commitment and stability of couples of Evangelical Filipinas married to Caucasian North American husbands. Earlier, Quinn (1984), Ortega et al. (1988), Larson and Goltz (1989), Robinson (1994), Wilson and Musick (1996), Call and Heaton (1997), and Wilson et al. (1997) have already reported similar findings in the case of intramarriage among North American couples.

Historically, Hellerman (2001:225) stresses the centrality of the family matrix in the early history of the Christian church. From the first-century Palestine to the third-century Carthage, the most important early Christian conception of community was that of a surrogate kinship group of siblings, who understood themselves to be the sons and daughters of God. The corporate nature and the priority of the surrogate sibling bond were the prominent and attractive features of the church then.

Theologically, Firet (1986:75) proposes that mutual paraklesis is not only about group loyalty or a sense of community. It is essential for the participation in salvation and for life in “the consolation of Christ”. It entails living in responsibility for one another. De Jongh van Arkel (1992:97–98) refers to Pearson (1982) in describing what the substance of mutual care in a church entails: 1. Emotionally oriented support such as love, intimacy, comradeship, acceptance, modeling, and assistance. 2. Cognitively oriented support includes encouragement, comfort, guidance, knowledge, and honesty (genuine open communication). Thus, one can see the place of accountability here. 3. Idealized support, such as admiration (interest, praise, commendation), and gratification (happiness to contribute to someone else’s life).

Upon reviewing the couples’ expectations and the contributions they received from their church participation, the specifications they mentioned parallel the descriptions of the authors presented above. For the Evangelical Filipina - North American Caucasian couples, frequent and joint participation in a church with clear Biblical teaching and practices and adequate mutual care has a positive influence on the couples’ marital commitment and adjustment.

### 3.5.3.3 Church participation and marital cohesion

Several participants voiced their concern about the cohesion questions of questionnaire 4 (item 11 - 14). They feel that the questions are vague, or ambiguous. The items are:

11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together? 12. Have a

stimulating exchange of ideas. 13. Work together on a project. 14. Calmly discuss something.

The question on outside interests was answered excluding church activities. The respondents thought in terms of hobbies. Also, several of the participants worked in the same job or ministry, and they were wondering whether this would count as working together on a project everyday. In spite of their doubts, they answered the best they could.

However, with several couples there is a relatively bigger gap between the Cohesion scores of the wife and the husband (see Table Q4, Questionnaire 4), for instance, couple 3 (W3: 14, H3: 9); Couple 5 (W5: 8, H5: 11); Couple 12 (W12: 14, H12: 9); Couple 17 (W17: 6, H17: 11); Couple 18 (W18: 6, H18: 9); Couple 23 (W23: 12, H23: 9). Questionnaire 4 does not contemplate assessing cohesion in terms of church activities as such. However, the personal interview on the couples' church participation reveals that the couples with the wider differences in their Cohesion scores in questionnaire 4 also have some negative experience in their church-participation.

W3: Their church has become too big. They came to this church because it has a good youth group and a ministry to people with a hearing problem. One of their children has a hearing problem. The church is good for their children, but not good for her personally. H3: He is not comfortable in the mega-church. He thinks that his wife is happy because she can contribute with her gifts. The people accept them, especially his wife, but he has an irregular work schedule and can attend only the worship service.

W5: They are no longer comfortable in their church that has grown to a mega-church (over a thousand members). It is geared to "seekers". They feel lost in it. They doubt that it is going to be the best place for them as a couple and as a family.

H5: The church has become too big. He feels that it does not meet the marriage and family needs.

W12: They have opportunities to serve because they are in a small church, but they do not feel spiritually fed. Her husband serves in many capacities in the church, but she often has to work on Sundays. Half of the time on Sunday evenings they attend a large community church (3000 members) where they feel spiritually fed. They are looking for a church where they can serve with their gift and be spiritually fed too. Their small church does not minister to a lot of couples. They started a couples' group but it did not continue. H12: He wants a church where they can both minister and be spiritually fed. He feels comfortable in their small Filipino church. The people are appreciative of his contribution, but he feels that the language barrier (a Filipino language) prevents him from having close relationships with the people. He also attends a big community church just to be spiritually fed.

W17: They do not have close friends in their church, because they only attend the worship service. Their work schedule prevents them from having more time for church involvement. They attend this church for the sake of their children, who have friends and like the youth group there. H17: He has difficulty mixing with people he does not know. He does not feel spiritually fed and he does not have good fellowship here.

W18: They serve together as a family in their church-planting ministry. This contributes to their marriage and family. However, they work with the poor. They are always the ones who must initiate programs and fund it. It is tiring for the marriage. They have little time to do things as a family beyond ministry in the church. Now she has asked her husband to set aside a date for the family. H18: He and his family are constantly on the giving end. They try to be a role model to the rest of the congregation. They do not feel that they receive enough spiritual nourishment themselves for their marriage. However, being involved as a whole family in the ministry strengthens the family bond. It teaches everyone to serve.

W23: She feels that the supportive and helpful attitude of their church toward her and her family enriches her marriage. H23: Their church contributes positively to their marriage by sharing their life together in the congregation. The church community reinforces their relationship as a couple. On the other hand, there is a downside of this living together in the community: more demand and expectation are placed on them as the pastor's family.

Beside the information on their church participation, the personal interview on Gender – role indicates that both W23 and H23 are employed. They manage their money separately. The wife also said that they had been single for a long time before they got married, so that they are accustomed to work and to manage their own money. It is their lifestyle and it is just based on commonsense. In other words, their relationship is somewhat detached because they married late and are used to a single lifestyle, but their constant sharing of life in the community, as a pastor's family also seem to hinder privacy that would foster marital cohesion.

Thus, questionnaire 4, item 11 – 14 may be vague, and may result in big differences in the way the spouses understood the questions. Their level of expectation of what is meant with the activities asked in the questionnaire may be dissimilar.

Even though Ortega et al. (1988) found homogamous religious doctrine and ritual as significant for marital happiness and success, in this study lack of spiritual nurture, lack of involvement in church participation and close fellowship correlate with relatively lower marital cohesion. Also, it is not helpful for marital cohesion when couples are overburdened with church ministry to the point of only being on the giving end, or when they are overinvolved in church fellowship to the extend of lacking private couple's time. The last mentioned group also has relatively lower scores on marital cohesion. Thus, not only homogamous religious doctrine and ritual in joint church participation are significant, but also joint church participation needs to be adequate.

### **3.5.4 Residence in North America or in the Philippines**

Part of the data is separated between the couples who live in North America and those who live in the Philippines, to pay attention to possible influences of cultural environment on: maintaining ties with the homeland; contribution of church participation to the well-being of the marriage, gender-role functioning, value on children, and dealing with differences.

The majority of the couples who live in North America visit relatives in the Philippines. Only one woman does not visit her relatives in her homeland, because she did not have a close relationship with them even before her marriage. However, 4 (25%) of the husbands never visited the Philippines. On the other hand, all couples that reside in the Philippines visit relatives in North America often. Also, 4 (51.1%) of the 7 husbands living in the Philippines do not have a warm relationship with the Filipino in-laws. This may indicate that there is less reluctance or difficulty on the part of the wives to maintain ties with relatives on either side than for their spouses. For several husbands maintaining ties with the wives' relatives is either difficult or unimportant. Thus, the closeness of ties may not be associated with the location. It may be more related to personality, language/cultural barrier, and upbringing.

With regards to church participation, 62.5% of the wives who live in North America experienced benefits from church participation for the well-being of their marriage, while 37.5% did not. Nonetheless, only one mentioned the language barrier as the problem. Among the husbands 87% experienced benefits for their marriage, but 12.5% did not. For the majority of couples, the quality of the Biblical teaching, the service and the fellowship were the issue rather than language or culture.

For the 7 couples that live in the Philippines, 6 (85.7%) benefited from their church involvement for the well-being of their marriage, but one couple (14.2%) did not. However, the problem was not related to their being in the Philippines. It was

because of their work schedule that hindered them from getting involved in the church, and because of personality. The husband has difficulty mixing with people he does not know. They did not get involved; they did not have close friends in the church. He did not feel spiritually fed in the church.

In gender-role, 6 of the 16 wives (37.5%) living in North America perceive their husband as the leader in their home, whereas 6 of the 7 (85.7%) of those in the Philippines do so. In North America 5 of the husbands (31.2%) perceive themselves as the leader, whereas in the Philippines 6 (85.7%) believe that they are the leader in their home. There seems to be an apparent difference between the two groups in this regard.

The majority of the couples based their position of gender-role on their interpretation of Biblical teaching. Despite their view on who is the leader, both groups establish a flexible distribution of gender-role tasks in their home that is mostly based on practical common sense.

However, the fact that the husband is the leader for relatively more couples in the Philippines than those in North America may suggest an influence of the cultural environment where they live. It may also be related to the fact that most participants who live in the Philippines are Christian workers. They may be more traditional in their outlook. Brinkerhoff and Mackie (1985) report in their study on students in Canada and the U.S. that religiosity leads to increased traditional attitudes.

On the issue of gender-role, Biblical teaching is significant for both groups, but cultural environment and theological view may have an influence on the interpretation of Scripture, although common sense directs the day-to-day distribution of tasks wherever they live.

As to the value of children, there is no difference where they live. All couples in this study based their perspective of the size of their family on their sense of responsibility to care and to give education for the children, and on common sense.

With regard to perception of the frequent marital disagreements they face, 62.5% of the wives who live in North America recognize the possibility of cultural elements in their differences. Only 31.2% of the husbands do so. For those who reside in the Philippines 57% of the wives identified their issues as cultural, and 14.2 % of the husband did so.

Thus, living in North America, where their culture differences are more evident may have helped the wives and the husband to be aware of the cultural issues in their discords. On the other hand, living in the Philippines did not result in more spouses noticing the issues of culture in their disagreements. There may be less cultural consciousness among those who live in the Philippine because of the modern westernized lifestyle in the city and the English spoken in their homes. This topic may be for further research. The sample of the couples in this group is small (7 couples).

More significant is that the wives recognize that the ability to acknowledge mistakes, or asking forgiveness do not come naturally because of their upbringing. Among the 16 wives in North America, 11 (62,5%) mentioned that this is the case, and all 7 (100%) wives who live in the Philippines confirmed that it is a cultural feature. Those living in the Philippines may have been more exposed to Biblical teaching, because many of them work with Christian organizations. Thus, they are more aware of it.

Moreover, seven of the 16 wives (43%) who live in North America underlined that Biblical teaching is helping them learn to apologize, and 4 of the 7 (57%) wives who live in the Philippines mentioned Biblical teaching as an influencing element in enabling them to apologize.

Among the husbands who live in North America, 9 of the 16 (56.2%) acknowledged Biblical teaching as an influencing element for their ability to apologize to their wives, but 5 of the 7 (71.1 %) of those living in the Philippines say so.

Consideration needs to be given to the fact that the majority of the couples living in the Philippines are Christian workers, so that their religiosity rather than cultural environment may be the significant factor.

Nonetheless, Biblical teaching is a significant influence for the willingness to apologize in initiating reconciliation when there is a marital disagreement, regardless where they live.

### **3.5.5 Conclusion**

3.5.5.1 Biblical teaching and church participation provide a common foundation. The intercultural Evangelical Filipina – North American Caucasian couples may be passing, or have passed through marital stresses similar to those present in Non-Evangelical intracultural marriages such as in, raising children, childlessness, differences in personality, in-law relationship, work and time pressures. These challenges can be magnified when spouses approach them through cultural perception and inclination. The situation can be stagnant when partners do not face the fact that cultural issues need to be understood and dealt with. On the other hand, there are cultural differences that take a lifelong adjustment and that must be accepted with unconditional love and grace.

Biblical teaching and church-participation were the main strengthening and enriching forces for staying committed to the marriage and making adjustments. Moreover, social pressure, parents' role- modeling, personal experience and the Philippine culture are part of the constraining element for marital commitment.

Biblical teaching and church participation do not erase differences in marital relationship, but they provide a common foundation and goal, and favorable environment for commitment and adjustment. In this regard, Couple 10, 14, and 16 are examples from the study.

H 10 (see table G 2) expresses that as a couple they have passed through unexpected testing during the first years of their marriage. He stuck to his commitment, because he loved her. He believes that love involves commitment. He bases it on Biblical teaching.

W14 (see List D II, 1. 1) admits that she would have given up, if she had not received Biblical teaching on marriage in her church. It teaches her to obey God. There are role models in church that she did not have from her background. Also, the church community holds them accountable as a couple.

W16 (See table G 1) testifies that as a couple they passed through tough times. They stuck together for the sake of their children. This is based on their Biblical conviction against divorce. Parental modeling and common sense reinforce their position.

An outstanding feature of the 46 participants is, that the spouses are dissimilar in their cultural background, and the religious background of their family of origin often displays a complex kaleidoscopic configuration of faith adherence.

Added to that, there is a variety in matters of their length of time of being committed Evangelicals, and in the age when they became Evangelicals. Only 2 of the 23 husbands professed to have been brought up as Evangelicals from birth. On the other hand, 43.4% became Evangelicals in their 20s and 30s, and one man converted at the age of 38, and another one at the age of 40. Among the wives, 52.1% became Evangelicals in their 20s and 30s, and others in their teens. Four of the wives have been Evangelicals less than 10 years (8 yrs, 8yrs, 6 yrs, and 5 yrs).

Therefore, it can be assumed that there is a great diversity in length and depth of their exposure to Biblical teaching. Nevertheless, the majority of the couples consult Biblical teaching for guidance out of personal choice, rather than out of tradition. Also, both the husbands and the wives attend church regularly. Thus, their situation accentuates the finding of Robinson's study among same-culture couples (1994). She

reported that religious orientation serves as guidance in dealing with decisions and conflicts.

#### 3.5.5.2 Biblical teaching and marital commitment and adjustment

Although parental modeling, social pressure, and the Filipino cultural value against divorce serve as constraining force in avoiding marital break-up, Biblical teaching is the most significant influence against divorce for the majority of the couples in the study.

Like the varied positions on divorce and remarriage among the Evangelicals in North America (House 1990), the situation among these intercultural couples is diverse. Their opinions can be grouped in: 1. No divorce and no remarriage. 2. Divorce is permissible based on case-by-case evaluation. 3. Remarriage is permissible when the divorce is an acceptable case. 4. No divorce, but not sure yet what the Bible teaches on divorce in case-by-case situation.

Nonetheless, for the great majority, Biblical teaching is the main source for establishing their position on this issue. Even for those who are not sure which position to take on the case-by-case situation, they are unsure because they do not know yet what the Bible teaches on these matters. Thus, Biblical teaching is their guiding principle.

In spite of the lack of conformity on the “case by case situation”, they are unanimous in that they all would not take a decision to divorce lightly. It is only possible when such a break-up is really unavoidable.

It is noteworthy that both the husbands and the wives consider abuse as a reason for separation for the protection of the victim and the children. They are aware that although not pursued, divorce may result if the perpetrator does not repent and change. This position is inconsistent with what Maceda expresses concerning the tendency of Filipinas to persist in unhappy or abusive marriage, because they have

been socialized in the Roman Catholic tradition, which prohibits divorce (Simmons 2001:136). In this study, the Evangelical Filipinas and their North American Caucasian husbands based their position on Biblical teaching combined with common sense. Several maintain that the Bible does not tolerate violence on the innocents.

Furthermore, Biblical teaching is the basis for the understanding of unconditional love in marriage. The Biblical concept of covenant marriage entails unconditional love (Anderson and Guernsey 1985; Balswick and Balswick 1991; Clark 1995).

Covenants are expressed through logic of moral involvement and unity (Bromley and Bushing 1988). In Christian covenant marriage commitment, the partners feel that marriage is sacred (Worthington 1999:70). Both parties treat each other as “one flesh”. They promise to love self-sacrificially, placing the other person’s welfare at least equal to one’s own well-being. Christ models the groom in relation to the church (Eph 5:25–31) (Balswick and Balswick 1991).

In their explanation of personal dedication in marriage, Stanley and Markman (1992) submit that it is the desire to maintain or to improve the quality of relationship with the partner for joint benefit. It is evidenced by the desire and behavior to continue the relationship and to improve it, to sacrifice for it, to invest in it, to connect it to personal goals, and not just to pursue one’s own but to consider the partner’s welfare.

The result of the study shows that Biblical teaching, or Biblical teaching strengthened by parental or other Christian’s modeling, common sense, or upbringing, form the foundation for the majority of the participants' understanding of this concept.

However, there is a slightly lower influence of Biblical teaching on the wives’ view of sacrificial love than on the husbands. For the minority of the wives the Filipino cultural values of “pagtitiis” (patiently suffering or forbearance) (Bustos and Espiritu 1996:89; Panopio and Rolda 2001:81), and “utang na loob” (reprocity) (Hollnsteiner

1964) may be confusing elements in the understanding of this concept of sacrificial love.

Notably, there is also a small minority of husbands who conceive this concept on the basis of common sense. Thus, although the majority of the couples based their understanding of sacrificial love in marriage commitment on Biblical teaching, in the minority of cases the view of sacrificial unconditional love is still lacking the spiritual dimensions.

It needs to be added here that, cognitive knowledge of the Biblical teaching of this concept does not guarantee full evidence in practical application. Two examples can be drawn from the study.

One woman, who has been in the faith for 8 years, asserts that she understands sacrificial love from the Bible. However, she admits that she is struggling in the practice of it. She is still learning and trying to change. In contrast, one man in the study knows the Biblical teaching well and quotes from it, but the personal interview reveals that he lacks awareness of his wife's needs. He is unaware of the lack in application of the concept. He has been an Evangelical all his life. Thus, the former case signals progressive adjustment, but the latter may suggest impediment to change.

In any case, for the majority of the couples Biblical teaching has a positive influence for the understanding and practice of unconditional love in marriage, but for the minority it is unclear.

Further, in marital adjustment, the issues of frequent disagreements are often associated with "conventionality" due to the spouses' cultural differences. The main cultural hurdles are: smooth interpersonal style of the wife vs. frankness of the husband; cultural view on children's discipline; the significance of financial support for the extended family; priorities concerning food, time, and spending. It is noteworthy that 22 of the 23 wives resort to silence when upset, and 22 husbands tend

to approach their wives to clarify the issue. This seems to agree with Lynch (1973a). He submits that Filipinos would consider silence or evasive speech for preserving peace and to avoid conflict, as part of the value of “SIR” (smooth interpersonal relationship). On the other hand, Americans prefer to clarify points. The latter is part of North American frankness and style of conflict resolution.

Considering the length of time of their marriage, those recurrent cultural issues may be gaps that take years to bridge or may require a lifelong adjustment process (Mc Goldrick and Prieto 1984; Crohn 1995; Romano 2001). Nonetheless, these couples seem to be dealing with the issues with sufficient flexibility and a forgiving attitude. The personal interview shows the significance of at least one of the partners learning to ask forgiveness or to apologize from Biblical teaching.

For most of the Filipina wives, apologizing does not come naturally due to the cultural elements of “amor propio” (self-respect or pride) (Church 1986; Jocano 1997). They themselves recognize it, and several are learning to apologize because of Biblical teaching. The willingness to apologize and to initiate reconciliation even of just one spouse is helpful for reestablishing the couple's communication, and making up after a disagreement. It helps the adjustment process.

Both the majority of the wives and the husbands acknowledge that Biblical teaching is the basis for their ability to apologize.

Another topic of adjustment is the relationship with in-laws. Lapuz (1977:50), and Medina (1995:178–179) report that in-law issues are the most frequent issues in Philippine marital difficulties. It is the negative side of the closely-knit extended family system and loyalty to the family of origin.

This situation is not a major issue in the group of Evangelical Filipina – North American Caucasian couples. Most of the spouses feel accepted by their in-laws. In the minority of cases there may be initial feelings of lack of acceptance by an in-law.

The reasons for this varied, but only in one case it was due to initial racial prejudice against the husband. In another case, the mother-in-law suspected that the Filipina married her son for a quick passage to North America. However, the prejudice was duly corrected.

In fact, more husbands lack warmth in their relationship to the wives' family. This may be in part due to language and cultural barriers. Most of the husbands do not speak the in-laws' language. In the minority of cases, issues of financial support for the wives' family are not helpful for the relationship. In contrast, the wives can speak English. For Filipino familism, bilateral extended family ties are important.

In-laws' intrusion is not a common issue among them, but when this happens the couples keep a united front, or place loyalty to the spouse before loyalty to parents based on Gen 2:24.

As to gender-role adjustment, these couples practice a flexible distribution of gender tasks. However, they based their position on, who is ultimately the leader in the home, on their interpretation of Biblical teaching. The functioning of their gender-role approximates the "continuum" or the "equality and submissive" model described in Howell (1979).

Notably, several wives are in the process of turning over leadership to their husband, because they believe that this is Biblical. The Philippine culture has a "double-layer" gender-role style because of its Malay matriarchal root and Spanish patriarchal influence (Hart 1980; Andres 1987; Medina 1991; and Zaide 1998).

In other words, when the Filipina- North American Caucasian couples practice gender-role distribution that seems egalitarian, it is not the result of modern Feminism but it is cultural. Go (1993) confirms that certain Filipino traditional cultural values persist into the 1990s. Among these is the feature of husband and wife egalitarian role combined with division of domain in decision-making. Likewise, Agbayani-

Siewart and Revilla (1995) assert that family authority among the Filipinos is not patriarchal but more egalitarian. Husband and wife share equally in financial and family decision.

It is important to add that following their conversion to the Evangelical faith, the Filipina wives turn to Biblical teaching for direction on gender-role. Thus, the couples' understanding of Biblical teaching on gender-role combined with practical common sense directs their gender-role adjustment.

Another point of adjustment is on the value of children. The Philippine culture assigns a high value on having children as gifts of God, as fulfillment of motherhood and evidence of manliness, as links for the bilateral extended family network system, and as security for old age (Andres 1987; Andres and Andres 1987; Matthews 1994; Panopio and Rolda 2001). To the contrary, North Americans consider children as valuable, but they are more gauged by the awareness of the responsibility of having children (Althen 2003).

For the intercultural couples in the study, the guiding principle for the size of family is based on the sense of responsibility and common sense, rather than on Filipino traditional view. Thus, the Filipina wives have acquired more modern views, or have switched to a North American perspective (Althen 2003). Childlessness is accepted as a circumstance that is ultimately God's will.

#### 3.5.5.3 Church participation and marital commitment and marital adjustment

Frequent and joint church participation has a positive influence on marital commitment and adjustment, where there is Biblical teaching that spiritually nurtures the members, and where there is an adequate mutual care. In such church participation, the couples experience: a sense of belonging and rootedness, a sense of extended family, common Biblical teaching, counsel on marriage and family matters, praying for one another, role-models for marriage life, accountability, common

friendships, feeling accepted and comfortable as a unit, being involved together as a family, and having a common bond and common focus.

Thus the situation of the intercultural couples agrees with Tseng (1977:102-103). He proposed the importance of the intercultural couples having a common goal toward which they are strongly motivated. Also, the findings of Wilson et al. (1997) is applicable in that, the frequency of church attendance increases exposure to like-minded people, and reinforces the same family values that they hold.

Further, this study agrees with Call and Heaton (1997) that, frequency of church attendance had the greatest impact on marital stability when both spouses attended church regularly.

Moreover, for the Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands, the benefits of church participation are more pronounced, because the partners come from different cultures. Added to that, their family of origin may be of a different faith.

The positive influences the couples experience in church participation confirm the significance of mutual care in the church community, which Firt (1986:75) and De Jongh van Arkel (1992:97-98) adduced. It is to be a community where there is caring and living in responsibility for one another in Christ.

Furthermore, Ortega et al. (1988) underlines homogamous religious doctrine and ritual as significant for marital happiness and success. However, the result of this study shows that a consideration must also be given to other elements of church participation. The lack of spiritual nurture, lack of joint involvement in church participation, and lack of close friendship in church correlate with lower marital cohesion. Also, ministering in a church to the point of being only on the giving end, or overinvolvement in a church fellowship to the extent of lacking a private couple's

time, are conditions that do not help marital cohesion. The latter situation is particularly possible among ministers and Christian workers in the group.

In sum, among the Evangelical Filipina – North American Caucasian couples, the diverse cultural background of the spouses often create differences in perspective on what they consider as proper or improper behavior. However, no obvious racial discrimination ensued from the racial differences.

Also, most of the participants have options to find a church where both spouses can feel comfortable as a couple. Moreover, the couples do not feel comfortable and spiritually nurtured in churches that overemphasize outreach to “seekers”, or social and political issues.

Cultural perspective and upbringing can obscure the understanding of the Biblical concept of unconditional sacrificial love, but understanding the Biblical concept on a cognitive level does not guarantee consistency in its application.

Finally, we return to the research questions: 1. How does Biblical teaching influence marital commitment and marital adjustment of the intercultural couples? 2. How does church participation influence marital commitment and adjustment of the intercultural couples?

Overall, this study finds that Biblical teaching has a positive influence on marital commitment and adjustment of Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. It functions as a constraining force against divorce, as the principle for unconditional sacrificial love, and as a guiding principle in dealing with differences and adjustments. It is the important foundation on which the couples aim at establishing common values for their marriage life.

The finding also shows that adequate joint church participation has a positive influence on the Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American

Caucasian husbands. It serves as their extended family, where they can feel rooted and belonging together as a couple and their children, and be spiritually nurtured. It helps establish a common Evangelical Christian identity, regardless of their different cultural and previous religious backgrounds.

## Chapter IV

### SUMMARY AND IMPLICATION

#### **4.1 Purpose and objective**

The purpose of the study is to examine the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment of Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. The result of the study is to contribute to the field of pastoral counseling by providing better understanding and a more specific focus in premarital and marital counseling with Evangelical intercultural couples.

Historically, in the Philippines interracial and intercultural mixing has been practiced for a long time. The evolution of the Philippine nation, culture and ethnicity shows evidences of interracial and intercultural blending. Currently, a large number of its citizens reside overseas. Today, most intermarriage occurs among Filipinos with foreign nationals in the country where they work (Saintjareth s.a.). The 2001 Survey of Overseas Filipinos (SOF) and Gender Quickstat 2002 show that the number of overseas foreign workers reached 1,030,000 as it stood in April 2001. Many women in the age group of 20 to 34 years are among them. The highest number of OFW (Overseas Foreign Worker) from the Philippines is in the U. S. Although Canada was not among the favorite places for OFWs, the U. S. and Canada combined have a high representation of the Philippine OFWs.

Trends show that intercultural marriages in North America are on the rise, because of the increase of urbanization, mobility, propinquity and other significant factors in society such as, modern transport, communication and globalization. Gordon (1966) and Baron (1972) already discussed these trends several decades ago. Root (1996) affirms the increasing trends. This is also true among the Evangelicals. Prinzing and Prinzing (1991) suggest that relatively few families will be able to avoid the issue of

intercultural dating and marriage in the coming decade. They maintain that churches need to deal with the issue of intercultural and interracial marriages that occur among Christians. However, the Evangelical churches have largely remained silent on this matter. When they have spoken the messages were mixed. Although the Evangelical denominations have given token and theoretical support, many church families transmit different messages (Prinzing and Prinzing 1991:105-106). The authors further assert that the church is not “they” but “we”. In other words, the issue concerns the Evangelicals as a whole.

A large amount of literature on Filipinas marriages with foreign men focuses on the mail-order bride phenomenon. Cahill (1990:134) states that the mail-order bride reputation has often unduly stigmatized Filipinas, who are married to a foreigner, even when they did not marry by means of a matchmaking agency. However, only 21% of Filipinas who married interculturally were mail-order brides (Ordoñez 1997:136).

Added to that, existing literature on Filipinas’ intercultural marriage underlines these women’s Roman Catholic religiosity as the strength that keeps them committed to the marriage and helps them in their adjustment to their intercultural situation (Samonte 1992; Beer 1996). Heinonen (1996) affirms that church activities and belonging to a church family are important factors for the well-being of Filipino immigrant families in Canada.

On the other hand, there is no existing literature that investigates the foreign husbands religiosity, although Beer (1996) alluded to it in her study on Filipina-German marriages. She wrote that when the Filipinas and their German husbands and in-laws were similarly religious Roman Catholics, religiosity was an asset for the adjustment of the Filipina to the in-laws and the community. To the contrary, when the husbands are not religious, the religiosity of the wives is tolerated, or it can become a problem for the marriage.

The present study is on Evangelical intercultural marriages, in which the wives are Filipinas, and the husbands North American Caucasian men. Steward and Bennett (1991), Bernard and Preli (1993), and Althen (2003) ascribe the mainstream dominant American culture to the White middle-class and upper middle-class Americans of European ancestry. Thus, the use of the term “Filipinas” and “Caucasian” North Americans does not imply racial purity for either of the population group. The delimitation is to clarify their mainstream or dominant cultural backgrounds. Nonetheless, the couples in the study were intercultural, interracial, but not interfaith.

Given that the study concerns Evangelical couples, attention was paid to investigate literature on the OT and the NT regarding the Biblical position on intercultural marriage. No prohibition was found against intercultural marriage between followers of Yahweh of diverse cultural backgrounds in the OT, neither was there among the believers in Christ in the NT. The OT stresses the preservation against contamination of the “seed of Abraham”, and for the preservation of God’s promise of the blessing to all nations through Abraham (Epstein 1942; Werman 1997; Hayes 1999; Rudolph 1949; van Oyen 1967; Robertson 1980; Sailhamer 1992; Martens 1994).

The NT emphasizes the universality and the unity of all believers in Christ. This understanding is evident for instance, in Calvin (Institute of Religion, Book IV, chap. 1, section 9), Robertson (1980:40), Erickson (1989:1035), and in commentaries on the Gospels (Carson 1994; Wessel 1994; Tenney 1995; Liefeld 1994; Longenecker 1994). While the NT is silent on the issue of intercultural marriage, it speaks against believers marrying unbelievers in 2 Cor 6:14-18, and alludes to rejection of it in 1 Cor 7:39. 1 Cor 6:15-20 warns believers against sexual immorality (Harris 1994).

Also, from a church historical perspective, in the early church the Christian community was functioning as a kinship group of siblings, who understood themselves as sons and daughters of God. The church was a family (Hellerman 2001:225). Thus, it can be deduced that intercultural marriages among believers in Christ of different backgrounds was not Biblically prohibited.

Literature on Christian marriage such as, Barber (1974), Adams (1980), Worthington (1989, 1999), Wright (1992) and others affirms that the Bible teaches the basic principles for Christian marriage. Also, the concept of marriage as a covenant is central for Biblical teaching on marriage (Anderson and Guernsey 1985; Balswick and Balswick 1991; Clark 1995). *The Christian Declaration on Marriage* issued on Nov 14, 2000 by major Evangelical denominations and Roman Catholics in America affirms the concept of covenant marriage. Inherent in this teaching is the concept of unconditional sacrificial love in marriage as modeled in the relationship of Christ and the church.

Furthermore, believers in Christ are members of a church fellowship in the body of Christ. In this community they experience acceptance, mutual care and edification (Berkhof 1979:396; Firet 1986:75; de Jongh van Arkel 1988:4, 1992:97-98; Erickson 1989:1037; Heitink 1993:277).

Therefore, Biblical teaching and church participation are significant for the well-being, and spiritual growth of the members. Moreover, several empirical studies on marital satisfaction, marital commitment, and marital adjustment, have found that the unity in religious orientation, and joint church participation have a positive influence on intra-cultural North American couples' marital relationship (i.e. Quinn 1984; Ortega et al. 1988; Larson and Goltz 1989; Robinson 1994; Wilson and Musick 1996; Wilson et al. 1997; Call and Heaton 1997).

It is noteworthy that, literature on intercultural marriage proposes that it is not the cultural differences per se that are the source of conflict in intercultural marriage situations. The conflict reflects personal attitudes toward the differences (Cottrell 1990). Also, Chan and Smith (1995) maintain that the stability, satisfaction, or marital conflicts of intermarried couples are not caused by the fact of their race or ethnicity per se. Attitudes to race and culture of the marital partners, and the potential conflictive relationship with in-laws and the perceptions of society can lower the

marital stability and satisfaction of the couples. Similarly, Markoff (1977:61) proposes that disapproval by society of a particular intercultural marriage can be detrimental to the marriage. The personal qualities and attitudes of the intercultural spouses that are conducive to building a successful relationship may be seriously tested. Thus, the attitude of the church toward intercultural marriages can be a significant factor for the well-being of such a marriage.

Consequently, both favorable attitudes of the spouses and the in-laws toward the differences in culture, and living in a social environment that is favorable toward intercultural marriages, are significant factors to consider. Presumably, Biblical orientation can positively affect attitudes, and healthy church participation can provide a supportive social network for intercultural couples.

Thus, theological considerations, the findings from studies on intercultural marriage, and empirical studies on marital commitment, marital adjustment and church participation, support the objective to research the influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment of Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands.

## **4.2 Design and method**

Chapter II of the thesis is dedicated to literature review, which includes five themes: (1) literature on intercultural marriage, (2) literature of Biblical theology on intercultural marriage, (3) literature of Evangelical perspectives on relevant issues of marriage, (4) literature on mainstream Philippine and American salient cultural values, and (5) literature of research on the influence of religious orientation and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment. Chapter III focuses on the fieldwork.

The study hypothesized that Biblical teaching on marriage and positive experience of church participation strengthens marital commitment and marital adjustment of the

intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. Thus, the fieldwork sought to answer two research questions: 1. How does Biblical teaching influence marital commitment and marital adjustment of the intercultural couples? 2. How does church participation influence marital commitment and adjustment of the intercultural couples?

Four questionnaires were used to collect data: questionnaire 1 gathered demographic information; questionnaire 2 was to clarify the frequency and type of the couples' church participation; questionnaire 3 was to assess the levels of marital commitment; and questionnaire 4 was to indicate the levels of marital adjustment. The one-hour personal interview with each spouse was to disclose the aspects of the influence of Biblical teaching, and the benefits of church participation on marital commitment and adjustment, and their intercultural specific issues.

The personal interview followed twelve principal questions that were expandable. The topics were on how they first met; their expectation for their choice of a church; the contribution of their church to the well-being of their marriage; relationship with in-laws; leadership in the home; position on divorce, remarriage and sacrificial love; the value of children; and their frequent issues of disagreement and ways of dealing with differences. The questionnaires were filled out over the phone, followed by the personal interview.

The research involved 46 individuals or 23 couples. Their shortest time of having been married was 7 years and 3 months. The longest was 37 years. One couple has been married for 7.5 months, and another one for 7.25 months. Five couples were married for 20 years, and the rest have been married over 10 years. All the women were in their first marriage. For one man it was his third marriage after a second divorce. One other man was in his second marriage after his first wife had died. Thus, all have been married for a considerable length of time.

The participants were found by contacting Filipino pastors and churches, through the Internet, and through networks of friends in the U. S., Canada, and in the Philippines. The couples were Evangelicals from various denominations. They were in different locations in the U. S., Canada and the Philippines.

### **4.3 Findings**

The situation of the intercultural couples studied agrees with Tseng (1977:102-103). He proposed the importance of the intercultural couples having a common goal toward which they are strongly motivated. It also concurs with Robinson's study among intracultural couples (1994). She reported that religious orientation serves as guidance in dealing with decisions and conflicts among the couples she studied.

The outstanding feature of the 46 participants in this study was that the spouses were dissimilar in cultural and racial background. Added to that, their families of origin often displayed a complex kaleidoscopic configuration of faith adherence. Moreover, there was a variety in matters of their length of time of being committed Evangelicals, and in the age when they became an Evangelical. It can be assumed that there may be diversity in the length and depth of their exposure to Biblical teaching. However, both the husbands and the wives attended church regularly. A large majority of the spouses consulted Biblical teaching for guidance in their marriage relationship and in dealing with their differences.

In other words, Biblical teaching and church participation do not erase the differences in a marital relationship, but they provide a common foundation and goal, and a favorable environment for strengthening marital commitment and marital adjustment.

Biblical teaching was also the most significant influence against divorce for the majority of the couples in the study. In addition, parental modeling, social pressure, and the Filipino cultural value against divorce served as constraining force in avoiding marital breakup. Nonetheless, they had diverse opinions regarding the case-

by-case consideration of marital problems to which permissibility or prohibition for divorce and remarriage could be applicable. Despite their lack of conformity in this area, they were unanimous in that they all would not take a decision to divorce lightly. They would only consider such a breakup as the last resort.

It is noteworthy that both the husbands and the wives considered abuse as a reason for separation for the protection of the victim and the children, and for counseling. They were aware that, although it should not be pursued, divorce could result if the perpetrator would not repent and change. This position is inconsistent with the belief that Filipinas have a tendency to persist in unhappy or abusive marriage, because they have been socialized in a Roman Catholic tradition that prohibits divorce (Simmons 2001:136). In this regard, the Evangelical Filipinas and their North American husbands attributed their position to Biblical teaching combined with common sense. Several maintained that the Bible does not tolerate violence on the powerless.

Further, Biblical teaching, or a combination of Biblical teaching strengthened by parental or other Christian's modeling, common sense, or upbringing, formed the foundation for the majority of the participants' understanding of the concept of sacrificial unconditional love in marriage. However, cultural tendency and upbringing could also obscure a Biblical understanding of this concept.

For the minority of the wives, the Filipino cultural features of "pagtitiis" (patiently suffering or forbearance) and "utang na loob" (reciprocity) may be obscuring elements to the Biblical concept of sacrificial love, which is modeled in Christ's love for the church (Eph 5:25-31). Bustos and Espiritu (1996:89) refer "pagtitiis" to the Filipinas' self-sacrificing attitude for the sake of the family and to make up for their husbands deficiencies. Panopio and Rolda (2000:81) describe it as an attitude that is expressed when certain frustrating forces are too powerful to overcome. "Reciprocity" is the value of indebtedness to mutually reciprocate favors received and given.

A minority of the husbands perceived the concept of sacrificial love in marriage as common sense; it was a reasonable way to resolve an impasse in conflicts and for maintaining the relationship. However, knowing the Biblical concept of sacrificial love in marriage on a cognitive level did not guarantee consistency in its application. It may suggest the importance of intrinsic religiosity for marital quality mentioned in Booth et al. (1995), and for marital happiness and communication (Hughes 2001).

Further, the couples manifested sufficient flexibility and a forgiving attitude in dealing with their differences. The issues of frequent disagreements were often associated with differences in cultural perspective. The main cultural hurdles were: the smooth interpersonal style of the wife vs. frankness of the husband; differences in cultural view on disciplining children; the significance of financial support for extended family of the wife; and priorities concerning food, time, and spending.

The majority of the wives and the husbands acknowledged that Biblical teaching was the basis for their ability to apologize or to ask for forgiveness. The wives admitted that apologizing was not their natural tendency, due to the Filipino cultural element of “amor propio” (self-respect, or pride). The willingness to apologize, and to initiate reconciliation, even of just one partner, was helpful for reestablishing communication between spouses and making up after a disagreement.

Lapuz (1977:50) and Medina (1995:178-179) report that in-law issues are the most frequent cases in Philippine marital difficulties. It is the negative side of the close-knit extended family system and loyalty to the family of origin. This situation was not evident among the participants of this study. In-laws’ intrusion was not a common issue, and when it happened, the couples were able to keep a united front, or to place loyalty to the spouse over loyalty to parents.

Most of the spouses felt accepted by their in-laws, although in the minority of cases there were initial feelings of lack of acceptance. The reasons for this varied, but only in one case it was due to an initial racial prejudice.

Furthermore, the finding shows that more husbands lacked warmth in their relationship to the wives' family than the wives to the husbands'. This may be in part because of language and cultural barriers. Most of the husbands did not speak the in-laws' language, whereas most of the wives could speak the language of their in-laws. Added to that, for Filipino familism, bilateral extended family ties are important. North Americans tend toward a nuclear and more individualistic system of society. In some cases, issues of financial support for the wives' family were detrimental for the relationship with the in-laws.

As to their position on who is the leader in their home, the couples practiced a flexible distribution of gender-role tasks. The Philippine culture has a "double-layer" gender-role style because of its Malay matriarchal cultural root and Spanish patriarchal influences (Hart 1980; Andres 1987; Medina 1991; Go 1993; Agbayani-Siewart and Revilla 1995; Zaide 1998). Following their conversion to the Evangelical faith, the Filipina wives turn to Biblical teaching for direction on gender-role. Several wives in the study were still in the process of turning over leadership in the home to their husbands because of Biblical teaching. Thus, how the couples understood Biblical teaching on gender-role combined with practical common sense, directed their gender-role adjustment.

The couples also had made adjustments in their perspective on the value of children. The spouses decided together as a couple how many children they would like to have. The Philippine culture assigns a high value to procreation. It considers children as gifts of God, as fulfillment of motherhood and evidence of manliness, as links for the bilateral extended family network, and as security for old age (Andres 1987; Andres and Andres 1987; Matthews 1994; Panopio and Rolda 2001). In contrast, North Americans consider children as valuable, but they are more gauged by the awareness of the responsibility of having and raising children (Althen 2003). For the intercultural couples in the study, the guiding principle for the size of family is based on a sense of responsibility for caring and giving them adequate education, and on

common sense. Childlessness is accepted as a circumstance that is ultimately God's will for them.

In matters of the impact of joint church participation, this study's findings echo the studies on North American intra-culture marriages of Ortega et al. (1988), Robinson (1994), Call and Heaton (1997), and Wilson et al. (1997), concerning the impact of shared church participation on the aspect of unity in marriage.

Robinson (1994) presented as one of her findings that church involvement provided friends and shared activities. Her study suggested that church participation might be the most significant source for friendship.

Ortega et al. (1988) reported that marriages across doctrines were less happy than those within the same doctrine. Religious doctrine and ritual affect marital success. Call and Heaton (1997) found that the frequency of religious participation had the greatest impact on marital stability. When both spouses attended church regularly, the couple had the lowest risk of divorce. To the contrary, when spouses differed in church attendance, the risk of marital dissolution increased.

It needs to be added that in this study all the intercultural couples were of the same faith and attended church regularly. In other words, there is no comparison with a sample group of those that did not attend church regularly, that were of different doctrines, or that were divorced. However, the finding of this study also showed the importance of adequate church participation. Ortega et al. (1988) underlines homogamous religious doctrine and rituals as significant for marital happiness and success. This study found that lack of spiritual nurture, lack of joint involvement in church activities, and lack of close friendship in a church correlated with relatively lower scores in marital cohesion. The study did not investigate whether the lower marital cohesion was the cause or the result.

Ministering in a church to the point of being only on the giving end, and being overly involved in a church fellowship to the extent of lacking private couple's time were conditions that did not seem to help marital cohesion. These couples in the study had relatively lower scores on marital cohesion. This situation occurred particularly among ministers and Christian workers in the sample.

Thus, it can be added that not only joint and frequent church participation, and homogamous religious doctrine and rituals are important, but that adequate church participation is a relevant factor for marital stability and happiness.

It is significant that, for these intercultural couples, whether the church was an ethnic, multicultural or "White" church, and the size of the church was ultimately not an issue. They looked for a church with the following criteria: where they can feel comfortable as a couple, belonging and rooted; a church that is like their extended family; a church with good Biblical teaching and practices, so that they are spiritually fed; a church that ministers to the whole family; a church with good fellowship and friendship. The wives, more than the husbands, desired to be able to contribute with their spiritual gifts. Churches that had grown too large and too focused on reaching out to "seekers" were mentioned as no longer ministering to their couple's needs.

Finally, in respond to the research questions and the hypothesis of the study, the investigation found that overall, Biblical teaching had a positive influence on marital commitment and marital adjustment of Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. Its function was as a constraining force against divorce, as the principle for unconditional sacrificial love, and as a guiding principle in dealing with differences and adjustments. It was the important foundation on which the couples attempted to establish common values for their marriage life.

Adequate joint church participation had a positive influence on the Evangelical intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands. It served

as their extended family, where they could feel rooted and belonging together as a couple and their children, and be spiritually nurtured. It helped establish a common Evangelical Christian identity, regardless of their different cultural or previous religious backgrounds.

#### **4.4 Limitations**

- Although the personal interviews were intensive, the sample size was quite small. The couples that live in the Philippines were mostly Christian workers, so that they may be more religiously conservative than the general population of Evangelical intercultural couples. The marriages of the couples were generally stable. Several prospective participants who had marital problems decided not to join in the study, because they had marital difficulties. Thus, there were no comparative data of those whose marriages were in distress.
- Although the findings can have applications to other intercultural couples' groups, the different configurations of intercultural couples will need culture specific studies. Replication with other intercultural couples' configurations may not have a similar result.
- Face to face interviews were not feasible due to the distance of the locations where the couples resided. There was no cluster of participants of Evangelical Filipina-North American Caucasian couples found in one specific place. Also, Filipino cultural consideration may favor the less direct communication method. The more distant encounter is less invasive and may avoid causing "hiya" (shame, or feeling one's ego being exposed) (Lynch 1962; Bulatao 1964). However, ocular and local influences were difficult to assess.
- This study was exploratory on the topic of intercultural Evangelical marriages, using a long-distance telephone interview method. The duration of about one

hour for the interview was a hindrance to some prospective participants for agreeing to take part in the study, while for the interviewer and those who participated, one hour seemed short.

## **4.5 Implications**

### **4.5.1 Implication for further study**

- Recruitment of more participants and comparison groups of regular and irregular church attendees, or of groups in which one spouse is a religious Evangelical and the other is not, would be an asset to the clarity of the result.
- A team of researchers working together on the study project rather than an individual would be worthwhile to consider. The recruitment and the interviews can be distributed according to location, even if the interview is still conducted by phone.
- A longitudinal study following the sample over the stages of marriage from newly-weds to the launching of children would present a picture of marital commitment and adjustment as a process.

### **4.5.2 Implication for Evangelical churches**

The attitude toward intercultural couples in the same faith needs to be in the sense of already belonging to the family of God, rather than considering those that are different as outsiders, who are joining the family. Prinzing and Prinzing (1991:105-106) remark that the Evangelical denominations have given token and theoretical support in dealing with intercultural and interracial marriages, but many church families transmit mixed messages. The issue concerns the Evangelicals as a whole. Therefore, it seems appropriate for Evangelical churches to move toward intentionally motivating interest in learning from different cultures, and for

appreciation of Christians from distinct cultures and racial backgrounds as enriching and essential parts of the body of Christ. For examples, a sensitivity training in multi-ethnic or interracial encounters is worthy of consideration to stimulate a congregation to be open and friendly toward people of other cultures and races. The NAE (National Association of Evangelicals) declaration on racism (1991) directed its ending paragraph to Christian parents to give careful attention to the attitudes they model and teach to their children. Christian parents are to *foster a biblical respect for all people, regardless of race or economic condition, as men and women created in the image of God.*

Cottrell (1990) and Chan and Smith (1995) found that stability, satisfaction, or conflicts of intercultural couples were not caused by the fact of their race or ethnicity per se. It is the attitude to race and cultures of the marital partners and the potential conflictive relationship with in-laws and the perspective of society that can lower marital stability and satisfaction. Churches need to strengthen their ministry with married couples in general. Candidates for intercultural marriage can benefit of a premarital intercultural counseling.

The sense of inclusiveness, universality, mutual care and accountability in the community of believers in Christ are theologically appropriate (Berkhof 1979; de Jongh van Arkel 1992, 1986; Tidball 1995; Hellerman 2001). Moreover, the finding of the study indicated that adequate church participation had a positive influence on intercultural couples of Filipinas with North American Caucasian husbands, in that the church community could serve as their extended family. In such a community, the couples and their children felt rooted and belonging. They looked for spiritual nurturing in the church. This was the place that could help them establish an Evangelical Christian identity, regardless of their previous backgrounds. Thus, the church is to be a community where the intercultural couples feel they are part of the family, where they feel accepted, nurtured, supported and held accountable. The wives feel more affirmed as member of the community, when their gifts are applicable and appreciated.

### 4.5.3 Implication for premarital and marital counseling

Possible pointers for counseling are:

- To clarify Biblical perspectives on the meaning of marriage, and unconditional love, and to bring out the significance of having a common ground in Biblical orientation as the basis for establishing marriage goals and guiding principles in resolving conflicts.
  
- To help the partners be aware of their own cultural values. To navigate the discussion and appreciation of cultural differences. Jones and Chao (1997:170) believe that the critical factors in the development of a healthy intercultural relationship are: (1) Conscious awareness by both partners of the role of culture in the relationship; (2) the ability by both partners to experience ethnic and cultural energies as an expansion rather than as a threat to self; and the ability of both partners to develop their own uniqueness. With regard to Jones and Chao's first item, our study also reveals the importance of learning mutual acceptance of cultural verbal and non-verbal communication styles.
  
- To navigate the negotiation in finding "cultural bridges" (Falicov 1995:237) on specific cultural values that may create hurdles, such as in issues of loyalty to parents and families of origin; financial support for the extended family; gender-role distribution; the type of discipline they experienced in childhood and the discipline style they would like for their children; priorities regarding time, food, and friendship; and how they would express disagreement, appreciation and apology.
  
- To discuss the importance of joint church participation, finding a church community, in which both spouses can feel accepted and comfortable as a couple, where they can use their gifts and be spiritually nurtured.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, B. N. 1980. *The family: A sociological interpretation*, 3rd. ed. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publ. Company.
- Adams, J. E. 1980. *Marriage, divorce, and remarriage in the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Agbayani-Siewert, P. and Revilla, L. 1995. "Filipino Americans". In Pyong Gap Min (ed). *Asian Americans: Contemporary issues and trend*, 134-368. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. .
- Agbayani-Siewart, P. 2002. "Filipino American culture and family values". In N. V. Benokraitis (ed). *Contemporary ethnic families in the United States: Characteristics, variations and dynamics*, 36-42. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Agoncillo, R. A. and Guerrero, M. C. 1987. *History of the Pilipino people*, 7th. ed. Quezon City, Philippines: Garcia.
- Airhart, P. D. and Bendroth, M. L. 1996. *Faith, traditions and the family*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Althen, G. 2003. *American ways: A guide for foreigners in the United States*, 2nd. ed. Yarmouth: ME: Intercultural Press Inc.
- Anderson, R. and Guernsey, D. 1985. *On being a family: A social theology of the family*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Andres, T. D. 1981. *Understanding Filipino values: A management approach*. Quezon City, Philippines: New Day Publishers.
- Andres, T. D. 1987. *Understanding Filipino values on sex, love, and marriage*. Manila, Philippines: Our Lady of Manaoag Publishers.
- Andres, T. D. and Ilada-Andres, P. B. 1987. *Understanding the Filipino*. Quezon City, Philippines: New Day Publishers.
- Anthony, M. 1993. The relationship between marital satisfaction and religious maturity. *Religious Education* 88, 97-108.
- Atkinson, D. J., and Field, D. H. (eds). 1995. *New dictionary of Christian ethics and pastoral theology*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.
- Augsburger, D. W. 1986. *Pastoral counseling across cultures*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster.

- Augsburger, D. W. 1993. "Cross-cultural pastoral psychotherapy". In R. J. Wicks and R. D. Parsons (eds). *Clinical handbook of pastoral clinical counseling*, 129-143. New York: Paulist Press.
- Bahr, Stephen J. (ed) 1991. *Family research: A sixty-year review, 1930 - 1990*. Ont, Canada: Macmillan Inc.
- Balswick, J. O. and Balswick J. K. 1991. *The family: A Christian perspective on the contemporary home*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Barber, C. J. 1974. What is marriage? *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 2, 48-60.
- Baron, M. L. (ed) 1972. *The blending American: Patterns of intermarriage*. Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books.
- Barth, F. 1969. *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Bartowski, J. P. 2001. *Remaking godly marriage: Gender negotiation in Evangelical families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bauzon, L. E. 1999. "Filipino-Japanese marriages". *Philippine Studies* 47 (Second quarter), 206-223.
- Beer, B. 1996. *Deutsch-Philippinische Ehen: interethnische Heiraten und Migrationen von Frauen*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Berger, R. and Hill, R. (eds) 1998. *Cross-cultural marriage identity and choice*. New York: Berg.
- Berkhof, H. 1979. *Christian faith: An introduction to the study of faith*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Blankston, C. L. III. 1999. Familism. In C. L. Blankston III (ed). *Encyclopedia for family life*, vol. 1, 475-480. Pasadena, CA: Salem Press.
- Blankston, C. L. III. 1999. Filipino Americans. In C. L. Blankston III (ed). *Encyclopedia of family life*, vol. 3, 608-611. Pasadena, CA: Salem Press.
- Booth, A. J. , Branaman, A. and Sica, A. 1995. Does religion matter in today's marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57 (3), 661-671.
- Booth, A. and White, L. 1980. Thinking about divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 42 (3), 605-616.
- Bowen, M. 1978. *Family therapy in clinical practice*. New York: Jason Aronson.

- Brinkerhoff, M. B. and Mackie, M. 1985. A comparison of Canadian and American student attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 47 (no. 2, May 1985), 415-429.
- Brock, D. R. 2001. *The role of Christian faith in marriages of differing personality types*. D. Min. diss., Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, New Jersey.
- Bromley, D. G. and Bushing B. C. 1988. Understanding the structure of contractual and covenantal social relations: Implications for the Sociology of Religion. *Social Analysis* 49S, 15-32.
- Browning, D., Miller-Mc Lemore, B. J., Couture, P. 1997. *From culture wars to common ground: Religion and the American family debate*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Bulatao, J. C. 1964. Hiya. *Philippine Studies* 12, 424-438.
- Burke, D. D. 1995. Evangelism. In D. J. Atkinson and D. H. Field (eds). *New dictionary of Christian ethics and pastoral theology*, 360-361. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity.
- Busby, D. M., Christensen, C., Crane, R. D. et al. 1995. A revision of Dyadic Adjustment Scale for use with distressed and non-distressed couples: Construct hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy* 21(3), 289-308.
- Bustos, A. S. and Espiritu, S. C. 1996. *Psychological, Anthropological, and Sociological foundations of education*. Quezon City, Philippines: Katha.
- Buttny, R. 1987. Legitimation techniques for intermarriage: Accounts of motives for intermarriage from U. S. servicemen and Philippine women. *Communication Quarterly* 35 (2), 125-143.
- Byrne, D. 1971. *Attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cahill, D. 1990. *Intermarriage in international contexts*. Quezon City: Scalibrini Migration Center.
- Call, V. R. A. and Heaton, T. B. 1997. Religious influence on marital stability. *Journal of Scientific Study of Religion* 36, 382-92.
- Calvin, J. *Institutes of Religion*, Book IV, chap. 1, section 9.
- Camper, C. 1994. *Miscegenation blues: Voices of mixed race women*. Toronto: Sister Vision Press.

- Carson, D. A. 1994. Matthew. In K. L. Barker and J. R. Kohlenberger III (eds). *NIV Bible Commentary, vol. 2: New Testament*, 1-135. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Carson, D. A. 1995. Matthew. In F. E. Gaebelin (ed). *Expositor's Bible commentary*, vol. 1: Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Catechism for Filipino Catholics*. 1997. Manila, Philippines: Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines.
- Cerroni-Long, E. L. 1984. Marrying out: Socio-cultural and psychological implications of intermarriage. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 16, 25-46.
- Chan, A. Y and Smith, K. R. 1995. Perceptions of marital stability of Black-White intermarriage. In C. K. Jacobson (ed). *American families: Issues in race and ethnicity*, 369-386. New York: Garland.
- Chao, C. M. 1995b. A bridge over troubled waters: Being Eurasian in the United States of America. In J. Adleman and G. M. Enguidanos-Clark (eds). *Racism in the lives of women: Testimony, theory and guides to anti-racist practice*. San Francisco: Haworth.
- Char, W. F. 1977. Motivation for intercultural marriages. In W. S. Tseng and J. F. Mc Dermott (eds). *Adjustment in intercultural marriage*, 51-61. Honolulu: Dept. of Psychiatry, John Burns School of Medicine, University of Honolulu.
- Chartier, M. 1978. Parenting: A theological model. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 6, 54-61.
- Christenson, L. 1970. *The Christian family*. Minneapolis: MN: Bethany.
- Chuah, F., Chuah, L. D., and Reid - Smith, L. et al. 1987. Does Australia have a Filipina brides problem? *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 22 (4), 573-583.
- Church, A. T. 1986. *Filipino personality: A review of research and writings*. Manila, Philippines: De La Salle University Press.
- Clark, D. 1995. Biblical and theological foundations of marriage and the family. In J. N. Blake and D. Ratcliff (eds). *Handbook of family religious education*, 5-35. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education.
- Clark, D. K. and Rakestraw, R. V. (eds). 1996. In *Readings in Christian ethics, vol. 2: Issues and applications*. Grand Rapids: MI: Baker Books.
- Clinebell, H. J. and Clinebell, C. H. 1970. *The intimate marriage*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Collins, G. R. 1988. *Christian counseling: A comprehensive guide*, rev. ed. Dallas, TX: Word Publishing.
- Cottrell, A. B. 1990. Cross-national marriages. *Journal of Contemporary Family Studies* 21 (2), 151-169.
- Crabb, L. J. Jr. 1982. *The marriage builder*. Grand Rapids: MI: Zondervan.
- Crohn, J. 1995. *Mixed matches: How to create successful interracial, interethnic, and interfaith relationships*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Crombs, R. 1966. Value consensus in partner satisfaction among dating couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 28 (May), 166-173.
- Curtin, P. D. 1971. *Imperialism* London: MacMillan.
- D'Antonio, W. V. 1983. Family life, religion, and societal values and structures. In W. V. D'Antonio and J. Aldous (eds). *Families and religions: Conflict and change in modern society*, 81-108. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- David, J. R. 1979. The theology of Murray Bowen or the marriage triangle. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 7, 259-262.
- Davies, A. 1988. *Infected Christianity, A study of modern racism*. Montreal: Mc Gill - Queen's University Press.
- De Jongh van Arkel, J. T. 1988. Die pastoraat: noodsaaklike onderskeidings ('n posisie bepaling na 25 jaar). In *Praktiese Teologie in Suid-Afrika* 5, 1-13.
- De Jongh van Arkel, J. T. 1992. "Care". Pretoria: UNISA (study guide for PTA 200 - W), 73-148.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. Care. Pretoria: UNISA (study guide for PTA 301 - 4), 64-275.
- Degler, C. 1980. *At odds: Women and the family in America from the Revolution to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Del Rosario, V. O. 1994. *Lifting the smoke screen: Dynamics of mail-order bride migration from the Philippines*. The Hague: Institute of Social Studies.
- Driskill, J. L. 1995. *Cross-cultural marriages and the church*. Pasadena, CA: Hope.
- Dumont, J. P. 1994. Matrons, maids, and mistresses: Philippine domestic encounters. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 22 (3), 174-191.
- Duty, G. 1967. *Divorce and remarriage*. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany.
- Editorial. 2000. "Bob Jones Rules". *Christianity Today* 44 (April 24), 41

- Edmonds, V. H. 1967. Marital conventionalization: Definition and measurement. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 29, 681- 688.
- Edmonds, V. H., Withers, G., and Dibatista, B. 1972. Adjustment, conservatism, and marital conventionalization. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 34, 96-103.
- Epstein, L. M. 1942. *Marriage law in the Bible and Talmud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Erickson, M. J. 1985. *Christian theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Escuadro, F. S. 1980. *The roles of husband and wives as perceived by rural and urban married couples*. D. Ed. diss. Manila, Philippines: Centro Escolar University.
- Estrada-Claudio, S. 1990. The psychology of the Filipino woman. *Review of Women's Studies* 1(2), 1-9.
- Falicov, C. J. 1988. Learning to think culturally. In H. A. Liddle, D. C. Brealin, and R. C. Schwartz (eds). *Handbook of family therapy supervision*, 335-357. New York: Guilford.
- Falicov, C. J. 1995. Cross-cultural marriage. In N. S. Jacobson and A. S. Gurman (eds). *Clinical handbook of couple therapy*, 231-246. New York: Guilford Press.
- Fine, M. A. 2003. Predicting commitment to wed among Hispanic and Anglo partners. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 65 (1), 117-130.
- Firet, J. 1986. *Dynamics in pastoring*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Forna, M. 1992. Differences that get under the skin: Race problem between black skinned people of different origins. *The Guardian* (July), 19-20
- Fox, R. 1961. Filipino family and kinship. *Philippine Quarterly* 2, 6-7.
- Fox-Genovese, E., Grenz, S., Keyes, M. et al. 2000. *Women and the future of the family*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Fredrickson, G. M. 1981. *White supremacy: A comparative study in American and South African history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gallagher, S. K. 2003. *Evangelical identity and gendered family life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gangel, K. 1977. Toward a biblical theology of marriage and family, part 1, 2, and 3. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 5, 55-69, 150-162, 247-259.

- Garcia, M. U. 1984. *Role perception and behavior of Filipino families in various ecological setting*. Paper presented at the 10th. National Congress of the Pambasang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino Faculty Center, University of the Philippines, Oct. 24-27, 1984.
- Getz, G. 1972. *The Christian home in a changing world*. Chicago, IL: Moody.
- Glenn, N. D. and Weaver, C. N. 1978. A multivariate multisurvey study of marital happiness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 40, 269-282.
- Glock, C. Y. 1962. On the study of religious commitment. *Religious Education Research* 42S, 98-110.
- Go, S. P. 1993. *The Filipino family in the eighties*. Social Development Research Center. Manila, Philippines: De La Salle University.
- Gordon, A. 1966. *Intermarriage: interfaith, interracial, interethnic*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gottman, J. 1994. *Why marriages succeed or fail: And how you can make yours last*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Gould, S. J. 1985. *The Flamingo's smile, Reflections in Natural History*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.
- Grunlan, S. A. 1984. *Marriage and the family: A Christian perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Gundry, P. 1977. *Woman, be free!* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Gundry, P. 1980. *Heirs together*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Guthrie, G. 1961. *The Filipino child and Philippine Society: Research reports and essays*. Manila, Philippines: Normal College Press.
- Guthrie, G. and Jacobs, P. 1966. *Child-rearing and personality in the Philippines*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Hall, E. T. and Hall, M. R. 1987. *Understanding cultural differences*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Hardgrove, B. 1983. Family in the White American Protestant experience. In W. V. D'Antonio and J. Aldous. *Families and Religions: Conflict and change in modern society*, 21-49. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Harris, M. H. 1994. 2 Corinthians. In K. L. Barker and J. R. Kohlenberger III (eds). *NIV Bible Commentary, vol. 2: New Testament*, 658-702. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

- Hart, D. V. 1980. Kinship and social organization in a Bisayan Filipino village. *Anthropos* 75, 722-780.
- Hayes, C. 1999. Intermarriage and impurity in Ancient Jewish sources. *Harvard Theological Review* 92 (1), 3-36.
- Hazeldon, K. 1959. *The racial problem in Christian perspective*. New York: Harper.
- Heinonen, T. 1996. Connecting family resilience and culture: Recreation and leisure among Filipino-Canadians. *Philippine Sociological Review* 44, 210-221.
- Heitink, G. 1983. *Gids voor het pastoraat als hulpverlening: Inleiding in de pastorale theologie en psychologie*. Kampen: Kok.
- Heitink, G. 1999. *Practical theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans
- Hellerman, J. H. 2001. *The Ancient Church as family*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Henderson, D. 1995. Mail-order brides: industry thrives. *The Seattle Times*. March 4.
- Hendricks, H. G. 1973. *Heaven help the home*. Wheaton, IL: Victor.
- Hiller, D. V. 1984. Sex equality, women's employment and the family. In S. L. Sexton, Voydanoff, P., and A. A. Zukowski (eds). *The changing family: Views from theology and social sciences in light of the apostolic exhortation familiars consortio*. Chicago, IL: Loyola University Press.
- Hollnsteiner, M. R. 1964. Reciprocity in the lowland Philippines. In F. Lynch (ed). *Four readings in Philippine values*, 3rd. ed., 22-40. Institute of Philippine Culture. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Hollnsteiner, M. R. 1965. Modernization and challenge to the Filipino family. In *The Filipino Christian family in a changing society*. A symposium on Dec. 3 - 5, 1965. Manila, Philippines: Christian Family Movement.
- House, W. H. (ed). 1990. *Divorce and remarriage: Four Christian views*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity.
- Howell, J. C. 1979. *Equality and submission in marriage*. Nashville, TN: Broadman.
- Hughes, P. C. 2001. *Keeping the faith (s): Religion, communication, and marital satisfaction in interfaith marriages*. PhD. diss., Faculty of Social Sciences: University of Denver.
- Hunt, C. L. and Coller, R. W. 1957. Intermarriage and cultural change: A study of Philippine-American marriages. *Social Forces* 35 (3), 223-230.

- Hunt, R. A. and King, M. 1978. Religiosity and marriage. *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion* 17, 399-406.
- Hurding, R. F. 1995. Pastoral care, counselling and psychotherapy. In D. J. Atkinson and D. H. Field (eds). *New dictionary of Christian ethics and pastoral theology*, 78-87. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.
- Imamura, A. E. 1986. Husband-wife role misunderstanding: The case of international marriage. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family* 16 (1), 37-47.
- Jelen, T. 1987. The effect of religious separation on partisan identification, voting behavior, and issue positions among Evangelicals and Fundamentalists in 1984. *Sociological Analysis* 48, 30-45.
- Jocano, F. L. 1995. Filipino family values. In A. E. Perez (ed). *The Filipino family: A spectrum of views*, 1-19. Manila, Philippines: University of the Philippines Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. *Filipino value system: A cultural definition*. Manila, Philippines: PUNLAD Research House.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Filipino social organization: Traditional kinship and family organization*. Manila, Philippines: PUNLAD.
- Johnson, M. P. 1973. Commitment: A conceptual structure and empirical application. *Sociological Quarterly* 14, 395-406.
- Johnson, M. P. 1991. Commitment to personal relationships. In W. H. Jones and D. Perlman (eds). *Advances in Personal Relationships: A Research Annual* 3, 117-143. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Johnson, M. P. 1995. Commitment. In D. Levinger (ed). *Encyclopedia of marriage and the family*, vol. 1, 121-125. New York: Simon Schuster Mcmillan.
- Johnson, W. R. and Warren, M. D. 1994. *Inside the mixed marriages: Accounts of changing attitudes, patterns, and perceptions of cross-cultural and interracial marriages*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Jones, A. W. 2001. *The decline of racial boundaries: Gender and modernization in the opening of international marriage markets*. PhD. diss., Department of Sociology University of Arizona.
- Jones, A. C. and Chao, C. M. 1997. Racial, ethnic and cultural issues in couples therapy. In W. K. Halford and J. Markman (eds). *Clinical handbook of marriage and couples interventions*, 157-176. Chichester, G. B.: John Wiley and Sons.

- Julag-ay, C. 1997. *Correspondence marriages between Filipinas and United States men*. PhD. diss., University of California Riverside.
- Katagiri, Y. 2000. Blurring the "color-line"? Reflections on interracial and multiracial America. *Christianity Today* 44 (April 2000): 41
- Keener, C. S. 1996. Final words. In D. K. Clark and R. V. Rakestraw (eds). *Readings in Christian ethics, vol. 2: Issues and applications*, 244-249. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Kelley, H. H. 1983. Love and commitment. In H. H. Kelley et al. (eds). *Close relationships*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Kellstedt, L. and Smidt, C. 1991. Measuring Fundamentalism: An analysis of different operational strategies. *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion* 30, 259-278.
- Kim, K. Y. 2001. *A program of marriage enrichment for Korean/American couples*. D. Min. diss. School of Theology and Missions: Oral Roberts University
- King, E. M. and Domingo, L. J. 1986. The Changing status of Filipino women across generations. *Philippine Population Journal* 2 (1-4), 1-31.
- Koehne, K. 2000. *The relationship between relational commitment, spousal intimacy, and religiosity and marital satisfaction*. PhD. Diss. Knoxville: University of Tennessee.
- Lapuz, L. V. 1977. *Filipino marriage in crisis*. Quezon City, Philippines: New Day Publishers.
- Larson, L. E., Goltz, J. W., and Hobart, C. 1994. *Families in Canada: Social context, continuities and changes*, rev. ed. Ont. Canada: Prentice - Hall.
- Larson, L. and Goltz, J. W. 1989. Religious participation and marital commitment. *Review of Religious Research* 30 (4), 387-400.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, Klein, C. N., Klein, E. B. et al. 1978. *Seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.
- Lewis, B. 1990. *Race and slavery in the Middle East* New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liefeld, W. L. 1995. Luke. In F. E. Gaebelin (ed). *Expositors' Bible commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Locke, H. J. and Wallace, K. M. 1959. Short marital adjustment and prediction test: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living* 21, 231-255.

- Longenecker, R. N. 1994. Acts. In K. L. Barker and J. R. Kohlenberger III (eds). *NIV Bible Commentary, vol. 2: New Testament*, 376-518. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Lund, M. 1985. The development of investment and commitment scales for predicting continuity of personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 2, 3-23.
- Lynch, F. 1962. Philippine values: Social acceptance. *Philippine Studies* 10 (Jan), 82-99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. Philippine values: Social acceptance. In F. Lynch (ed). *Four readings in Philippine values*, 2nd. rev. ed. Institute of Philippine Culture, Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. Social acceptance. In F. Lynch and A. de Guzman II (eds). *Four Readings on Philippine values*, 3rd. ed. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Malone, R. Monsignor and Connery, John R. S.J. 1984. *Contemporary perspectives on Christian marriages: Propositions and papers from the International Theological Commission*. Chicago: IL: Loyola University Press.
- Mare, W. H. 1994. 1 Corinthians. In K. L. Barker and J. R. Kohlenberger III (eds). *NIV Bible Commentary, vol. 2: New Testament*, 606-657. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Maretzki, T. W. 1977. Intercultural marriage: An introduction. In W. S. Tseng and J. F. Mc Dermott (eds). *Adjustment in intercultural marriage*, 33-40. Dept. of Psychiatry, John Burns School of Medicine, Honolulu: Univ. of Honolulu.
- Markoff, R. 1977, Intercultural marriage: Problem areas. In W. S. Tseng and J. F. Mc Dermott (eds). *Adjustment in intercultural marriage*, 51-61. Dept. of Psychiatry, John Burns School of Medicine, Honolulu: Univ. of Honolulu.
- Martens, E. A. 1994. *God's design: A focus on Old Testament Theology*, 2nd. ed., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Maston, T. B. 1959b. *The Bible and Race*. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- Matthews, P. 1994, Compadrazgo: Culture as performance. In R. Petierra and E. F. Ugarte (eds). *Cultures and texts: Representations of Philippine society*. Quezon City, Philippines: University of the Philippines Press.
- Mc Goldrick, M., Pearce, J., Giordano, J., Pearce, J. K. (eds). 1982. *Ethnicity and family therapy*, 2nd. ed. New York: Guilford Press.

- Mc Goldrick, M. and Garcia-Preto, N. 1984. Ethnic intermarriage: Implications for therapy. *Family Process* 23, 347-364.
- McLean, S. 1984. *The language of covenant and a theology of the family*. Paper presented at the seminar "Consultation on Theology of the Family" (1984), Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.
- Medina, B. T. 1991. *The Filipino family*. Quezon City, Philippines: University of the Philippines Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. Issues relating to Filipino marriage and family. In A. E. Perez (ed). *The Filipino family: A spectrum of views*, 27-39. Manila: University of the Philippine Press.
- Medina, B. T. and De Guzman, E., Roldan, A. A. et al. 1996. *The Filipino family: Emerging structures and arrangements*. Office of Research Coordination, Manila: University of the Philippines Press.
- Mendez, P. P. and Jocano F. L. et al. 1984. *The Filipino family in transition: A study in culture and education*. Research and Development Center, Manila: Centro Escolar University.
- Montagu, A. 1971. Race: The history of an idea. In R. Miller and P. J. Dolan (eds). *Race awareness, the nightmare and the vision*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Murstein, B. 1970. Stimulus-value-role: A theory of marital choice. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 32 (Aug), 465-481.
- Nadal, K. L. 2004. Filipino American identity development model. *Journal of Multicultural counseling and development* 32 (1), 45-62.
- Nakashima, C. L. 1992. An invisible monster: The creation and denial of mixed race people in America. In M. P. P. Root (ed). *Racially mixed people in America*, 162-178. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Neufeld, E. 1944. *Ancient Hebrew marriage laws*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Niebuhr, H. R. 1951. *Christ and culture*. New York: Harper.
- Nolledo, J. N. 2000. *The family code of the Philippines annotated*, 2000 rev. ed. Caloocan City, Philippine: Philippine Graphic Arts.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H., Barnes, H. et al. 1989. *Families: What makes them work*, updated ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- O'Neal, V. P., Brown, P. M., and Abadie, T. 1997. Treatment for interracial couples. In P. M. Brown and J. S. Shalett (eds). *Cross-cultural practice with couples and families*, 15-31. Binghamton, NY: The Hayworth Press.
- Ordoñez, R. Z. 1997. Mail-order brides: An emerging community. In M. P. P. Root (ed). *Filipino Americans: Transformation and identity*, 121-142. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ortega, S. T. , Whitt, H. P., and William, J. A. 1988. Religious homogamy and marital happiness. *Journal of Family Issues* 9 (2), 224-239.
- Pait, J. Community Relations Coordinator, Bob Jones University, Admission Office. Letter to James Landrith, Alexandria, VA, Aug. 31, 1998.
- Panopio, I. S. and Rolda, R. S. 2000. *Society and culture: Introduction to Sociology and Anthropology*. Quezon City, Philippines: JMC Press.
- Pearson, R. E. 1982. Support: Exploring of a basic dimension on informal help and counseling. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal* 61, 83-87.
- PDI Mindanao Bureau. 1996. Sixty Filipinas marry foreigners every day, join husbands abroad. *Philippine Daily Inquirer* (Manila) (June 7, 1996), 20.
- Pieterse, H. J. C. 1992. Communication theories in preaching. Pretoria: UNISA (study guide for PTA 200 - W), 57-72.
- Popkin, R. H. s. a. Pre-Adamism in 19th Century American Thought, 'Speculative Biology' and Racism. *Philosophia (Israel)* 8 (1978 -1979), 205-239.
- Porio, E., Lynch, F., Hollsteiner, M. et al. 1978. *The Filipino family community and nation*. Institute of Philippine Culture papers 12. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R. G. 1996. *Immigrant America: A portrait*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Pramann, R. F. Jr. 1986. *Commitment to spouse and God: The relationship among measures of marital commitment and spiritual maturity*. Unpublished doctoral diss., Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon.
- Preli, R. and Bernard, J. M. 1993. Making multiculturalism relevant for majority culture graduate students. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 19 (1), 5-16
- Priest, J. 1843. *Slavery as it relates to the Negro, or African race*. Albany: Van Benthuysen and Co.

- Priest, J. 1851. *Bible defense of slavery or the origin, history and fortunes of the Negro race*. Louisville: J. F. Brennan.
- Prinzing, F. and Prinzing, A. 1991. *Mixed messages*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Quinn, J. B. 1984. *The relationship between religiosity and marital satisfaction correlations among the Religious Orientation Scale, the Spiritual Well-Being Scale and Marital Satisfaction Scale*. PhD. diss., Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon.
- Rafel, S. S. 1954. Patterns of adjustment in 20 American-Filipina families. *Philippine Sociological Review* 2 (no. 3, Oct.), 3-10.
- Rempola, L. E. 2005. Undiman as a vehicle for worship, witness, and service in the Philippine context. Paper presented at the 1st annual forum on theology: *Doing theology in the Philippine context*, sponsored by Asian Theological Seminary, Manila, Feb. 2005.
- Reiss, I. 1980. *Family systems in America*, 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Robertson, O. P. 1980. *The Christ of the covenants*. Phillipsburg, NY: Presbyterian and Reformed Publ. Co.
- Robinson, I. E. and P. W. Blanton. 1993. Marital strengths in enduring marriages. *Family Relations* 42, 38-45.
- Robinson, L. C. 1994. Religious orientation in enduring marriage: An exploratory study. *Review of Religious Research* 35 (3), 207-218.
- Rokeach, M. 1973. *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Romano, D. 2001. *Intercultural marriage: Promises and pitfalls*, 2nd. ed. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Root, M. P. P. 1992. *Racially mixed people in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Roth, P. D. 1988. Spiritual well-being and marital adjustment. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 16, 153 - 158.
- Rudolph, W. 1949. *Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Esra und Nehemia*. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck.

- Rusbult, C. E. 1983. A longitudinal test of investment model: The development and deterioration of satisfaction in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 45, 101-17.
- Rusbult, C. E., Verett, J., Witney, G. H. et al. 1991. Accommodation processes in close relationships: Theory and preliminary empirical evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 60 (1), 53-78.
- Rusbult, C. E. and Verette, J. 1991. An interdependence analysis of accomodation processes in close relationships. *Representative Research in Social Psychology* 19 (1), 3-33.
- Rusbult, C. E. and Buunk, B. P. 1993. Commitment processes in close relationships: An interdependence analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 10, 175 - 204.
- Russel, K., Wilson, M., and Hall, R. 1992. *The color complex: The politics of skin color among African Americans*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ryrie, C. C. 1996. Biblical teaching on divorce and remarriage. In D. K. Clark and R. V. Rakestraw (eds). *Readings in Christian ethics, vol. 2: Issues and applications*, 231-243. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Sabatelli, R. M. and Cecil-Pigo, E. F. 1985. Relational interdependence and commitment in marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 47 (4), 931-937.
- Sailhamer, J. H. 1992. *The Pentateuch as narrative*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Salita, R. T. 1993. One of every three emigrants weds foreigner. *Manila Times* 35 (June 9), Special report, 1.
- Samonte, E. L. 1992. Sources of stress and coping mechanisms of Filipinas in West Germany and Holland. *Philippine Journal of Psychology* 25 (1), 20-39.
- Samonte, E. L. 1994. Acculturation difficulties of Filipina brides in Japan and opportunities for intervention. *Philippine Journal of Psychology* 27 (1-2, Jan - Dec), 43-58.
- Santa Rita, E. 1996. Filipino families. In M. McGoldrick, J. Giordano, and J. Pearce (eds). *Ethnicity and family therapy*, 2nd. ed., 324-329. New York: Guildford Press, 324-329.
- Saucy, R. L. 1996. The husband of one wife. In D. K. Clark and R. V. Rakestraw (eds). *Readings in Christian ethics, vol. 2: Issues and applications*, 250-254. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

- Schlesinger, B. 1998. *Strength in families: Accentuating the positive*. Paper prepared for the Vanier Institute of the Family, Ont. Canada.
- Schlueter, C. J. 1997. Revitalizing interpretations of Eph. 5: 22. *Pastoral Psychology* 45 (4), 317-339.
- Segal, R. 1967. *The race war: The world-wide conflict of races*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Sheehy, G. 1976. *Passages*. New York: Dutton.
- Shibutani, T. and Kwan, K. M. 1965. *Ethnic stratification*. New York: Macmillan.
- Simmons, L. A. 2001. *Marriage migration, and markets: International matchmaking and international feminism*. PhD. diss. The Faculty of the Graduate School of International Studies: University of Denver.
- Small, D. H. 1986. *Remarriage and God's renewing grace*. Grand Rapids: MI: Baker Book House.
- Soanes, C. and Hawker S. (eds). 2005. *Compact Oxford English dictionary of correct English*, 3rd. ed. Oxford: University Press.
- Sollor, W. 2000. *Interracialism: Black-White intermarriage in American history, literature, and law*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spanier, G. B. 1976. Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* (Feb.), 15-28.
- Spanier, G. B. and Thompson, L. 1982. A confirmatory analysis of Dyadic Adjustment Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 44, 731-738.
- Spickard, P. R. (1989). *Mixed blood*. Madison, Wis.: U of Wisconsin.
- Stacey, J. 1990. *Brave new families: Stories of domestic upheaval in late twentieth Century America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stanley, S. M. and Markman, H. J. 1992. Assessing commitment in personal relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54 (3), 595-611.
- Stanley, S., Trathen, D., and Mc Cain, S. et al. 2002. *The lasting promise. A Christian guide to fighting for your marriage*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Steward, E. C. and Bennett, M. J. 1991. *American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective*, 2nd. ed. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Stott, J. R. W. 1978. *Divorce*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity.

- Sung, B. L. 1990. Chinese American intermarriage. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 21, 337-353.
- Swindoll, C. R. 1995. *Growing deep in the Christian life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Tamis-Le Monda, C. S. and Wang, S. 2000. Values, child-rearing. In L. Balter (ed). *Parenthood in America: An encyclopedia*, 661-664. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC. CLLO.
- Tenney, M. C. 1995. John. In F. E. Gaebelin (ed). *Expositors' Bible commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Thompson, D. 1989. *Counseling and divorce*. Dallas, TX: Word Publishing.
- Tilson, E. 1958. *Segregation and the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Tidball, D. J. 1995. Practical and pastoral theology. In D. J. Atkinson and D. H. Field (eds). *New dictionary of Christian ethics and pastoral theology*, 42-48. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity.
- Touliatos, J., Permuter, B. F., and Strauss. A. (eds). 2001. *Handbook of family measurement techniques, vol. 2*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. 1995. *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tseng, W. S. 1977. Adjustment in intercultural marriage. In W. S. Tseng and J. F. Mc Dermott (eds). *Adjustment in intercultural marriage*, 93-103. Dept. of Psychiatry, John Burns School of Medicine, Honolulu: University of Honolulu.
- U. S. Supreme Court opinion, 461 U.S. 574 (1983). *Bob Jones University v. United States*
- Van Lange, P. A., Rusbult, C. E., Drigotas, S. M. et al. 1997. Willingness to sacrifice in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 72 (6)1373 -1395.
- Van Oyen, H. 1967. *Ethik des Alten Testaments, Geschichte der Ethik, Band 2*. Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn.
- Vaughan, A. T. 1982. From White Man to Redskin: Changing Anglo American perceptions of the American Indian. *American Historical Review* 87, 917 - 951.
- Wehrly, B., Kenney, K. R., and Kenney, M. E. 1999. *Counseling multiracial families*. Cultural aspects of counseling series, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Werman, C. 1997. Jubilees 30: Building a paradigm for the ban of intermarriage. *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1), 1-22.
- Westermann, C. 1974. *Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament. Genesis Kapitel 1-11*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins GmbH.
- Wessel, W. W. 1994. Mark. In K. L. Barker and J. R. Kohlenberger III (eds). *NIV Bible Commentary, vol. 2: New Testament*, 136-205. Grand Rapids: MI: Zondervan.
- Wilcox, C. 1986. Fundamentalism and politics: An analysis of the effects of different operational definitions. *Journal of Politics* 48, 355-362.
- Wilson, J., Parnell, A. M., and Pagnini, D. L. 1997. Religious fundamentalism and family behavior. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 8, 163-191.
- Wilson, J. and Musick, M. 1996. Religiosity and marital dependency. *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion* 35 (1), 30-40.
- Wilson, M. R. and Filsinger, E. E. 1986. Religiosity and marital adjustment: Multi-dimensional interrelationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48 (Feb.), 147-151.
- Winchell, A. 1880. *Preadamites: Or a demonstration of the existence of men before Adam*, 2nd. ed. Chicago: S. O. Griggs and Co.
- Worthington, E. L. Jr. 1989. *Marriage Counseling. A Christian approach to counseling couples*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. *Hope-focused marriage Counseling: A guide to brief- therapy*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity.
- Wright, H. N. 1992. *The premarital counseling handbook*. Chicago, IL: Moody.
- Wright, R. 1993. *Stolen continents, the "New World" through Indian eyes*. Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Yamauchi, E. M. 1978. Cultural aspects of marriage in the ancient world. *Bibliotheca Sacra* (July - September), 241-252.
- Yap, J. 1983. Sex and the Filipino psyche. *Asian-American News* 8 (8), 1-5.
- Zaide, C. A. Jr. 1998. *Preparing for responsible parenthood*, 4th. ed. Manila, Philippines: Navotas Press.

## REFERENCES FROM ELECTRONIC SOURCES

- 2001 Survey of Overseas Filipinos (SOF).  
<http://www.census.gov.ph/data/pressrelease/2002/of01tx.html>
- Biblical Discernment Ministries. 2000. *Bob Jones University(BJU): A bastion of Bible Christianity?*  
<http://www.rapidnet.com/~jbeard/bdm/Psychology/bju/fundam.htm> (2003)  
(March 2000 Revised).
- Gender Quickstat 2002. <http://www.census.gov.ph/data/quickstat/qsgender.html>.
- Hogue, C. 1999. *Racism in Asian*. Australia in Asia Series. The Asia-Australia Institute: University of NSW.  
<http://216.239.51.100/search?q=cache:qJGIRgxwOKEC:www.abc.net.au/rn/talks/bbing/docs>
- Jones, Bob III. 2000. *A letter to the Nation from Bob Jones University* (March, 3).  
[http://www.bju.edu/aboutju/special articles/response/response.xml](http://www.bju.edu/aboutju/special%20articles/response/response.xml)
- McCaskell, T. 1994. *A history of race/ism*. Toronto Board of Education.  
[www3.sympatico.ca/twshreve/inclusive/historyRacism.htm](http://www3.sympatico.ca/twshreve/inclusive/historyRacism.htm)
- National Evangelical Association (NAE). 1991. *Racism*.  
<http://www.nae.net/index.cfm?FUSEACTION=editor.page&pageID=233&IDCategory=9>
- National Evangelical Association (NAE). 2000. *A Christian Declararion on Marriage*.  
<http://www.nae.net/index.cfm?FUSEACTION=editor.page&pageID=233&IDCategory=9>
- Rogers, D. 1998. *The evidence of Black people in the Bible*.  
<http://www.wcg-org/wn/98may/black.html>
- Saintjareth. s. a. *Historical evolution of the Philippines*. Geographical and historical evolution of the Philippines.  
<http://www.angelfire.com/il/saintjareth/evolution.html>
- Stern, K. S. 1999. Understanding the Summer of hate. *The American Jewish Commitee Publication*.  
[http://www.ajc.org/In the Media/PublicationsPrint.asp?did=136](http://www.ajc.org/In%20the%20Media/PublicationsPrint.asp?did=136)
- The Christian - Israel*. s. a. <http://www.crutcherpa.com/interracialmarriage.htm>

## Informed Consent

This informed consent expresses my commitment to protect your interest when you participate in this research.

1. The purpose of the study is to investigate the possible influence of Biblical teaching and church participation on marital commitment and adjustment of intercultural marriage.
2. You will give about one hour of agreed upon telephone interview time to complete questionnaires of demographic and church participation information, marital adjustment, and marital commitment, followed by a conversation on issues of church participation, marital commitment and marital adjustment. We will initiate the phone call and it will not be charged to you.
3. Your spouse will have a similar telephone interview on the same day or a few days apart from yours.
4. Your identity will be kept confidential. A code number will be used instead of your name to identify the data.  
You may withdraw your participation at any time, should you wish to do so. There are no foreseeable negative effects on you by participating in this project. As a token of our appreciation, after completion of the study, each participating couple will receive a copy of the summary of the findings.

Researcher:

L. M. Pfeil

Should you need more clarification, please contact me by E-mail: ....., or ....., or locally in Cebu by phone: .....

As a token of your willingness to participate, please indicate by signing your initial: \_\_\_\_\_

Please mail it back to one of the addresses below (a return envelope is included), or indicate your acceptance in a short reply by e-mail. We will then proceed setting up an appointment for the interview.

U.S. Mail: L. Pfeil,  
.....  
....., USA

Philippines: L. Pfeil  
.....  
.....,  
Philippines

Canada: L. Pfeil  
.....  
....., Canada

E-mail: .....  
.....

## INFORMATION ON PROCEDURE

Dear participants,

Thank you for your willingness to help by participating in this project. The following is to clarify how we will pursue the telephone interview.

### **Procedure**

1. Once you have understood and accepted the informed consent, we will set up a separate telephone interview for you and your spouse. The interview will be about one hour. I will initiate the phone call. Your interview and that of your spouse can be done consecutively on the same day or a few days apart.
2. By E-mail, fax, or mail, you have received questionnaire 3 and questionnaire 4. Please **do not fill them out** and **do not share your answers** with your spouse before the interview.
3. These questionnaires will be filled out during the telephone interview, in which you will indicate to the interviewer the number on the scale you fill out on each item in the questionnaire you have before you. The interviewer will have a questionnaire that is identical to yours and will mark the same number on the same question.
4. As you fill out the questionnaires, read the statements carefully. If you are not sure how to give the exact answer, answer the best you can. There is **no right or wrong** answer. Respond the way you feel at the moment. Please, do not skip answering any of the questions. However, if the language is not understandable, you may ask the interviewer for clarification.
5. After completing the questionnaires there will be a conversation time for clarification of certain items in the questionnaires and on personal issues of church participation, marital commitment and adjustment.

I am deeply grateful for your interest, your time, your effort, and your help.

Sincerely,

Lan M. Pfeil

**Questionnaire 1**

Couple # \_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_

Please indicate the description that fits you.

1. Age: \_\_\_\_

2. Husband \_\_\_\_ / Wife \_\_\_\_

3. Education: \_\_\_\_ Elementary School  
\_\_\_\_ Junior H. S. (grades 6 - 8)  
\_\_\_\_ High School (grades 9 - 12)  
\_\_\_\_ College  
\_\_\_\_ Post College Education

*If other, specify:* \_\_\_\_\_

4. Cultural background: \_\_\_\_ Philippine  
\_\_\_\_ North American

5. Racial background: \_\_\_\_ Asian  
\_\_\_\_ Caucasian

6. Religion: \_\_\_\_\_ (Write the name of the denomination)

7. How long have you been an Evangelical Christian \_\_\_\_\_?

8. Marriage:

Have you been married previously \_\_\_\_ (yes). \_\_\_\_ (no)

Length of current marriage \_\_\_\_\_ years.

Number of children \_\_\_\_\_

Age of the oldest child \_\_\_\_\_

Age of the youngest child \_\_\_\_\_

**Questionnaire 2**

Couple # \_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_

Please check the description, which fits your situation:

1. Husband: \_\_\_\_/Wife \_\_\_\_

2. On the average, how often do you attend church on Sunday per month?  
(\_\_ Once) (\_\_ twice) (\_\_ three times) (\_\_ every Sunday)

3. Which of the following church activities do you attend regularly?

- Worship service
- Sunday School
- Prayer meeting
- Bible study group
- Cell-group
- Couples' group/activity
- Choir practice

If there are other/s, specify it/those:

4. Which church activities do you regularly attend jointly with your spouse?

- Worship service
- Sunday School
- Prayer meeting
- Bible study group
- Cell group
- Couple's group/activity
- Choir practice

If there are other/s, specify it/those:

**Questionnaire 3**      Couple# \_\_\_\_\_(H / W), Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please circle any number from 1 to 7 indicating how strongly you disagree or agree with each of the following statements. Number "1"= "strongly disagree". Number "7"= "strongly agree".

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I strongly Disagree						I strongly Agree

1. My friends would not mind it if my partner and I broke up.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Except when a spouse dies, marriage should be a once-in-a-lifetime commitment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I am willing to develop a strong sense of an identity as a couple with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I do not get much fulfillment out of sacrificing for my partner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I tend to think about how things affect "us" as a couple more than how things affect "me" as an individual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. My friends want to see my relationship with my partner continue.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. A marriage is a sacred bond between two people which should not be broken.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. It makes me feel good to sacrifice for my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. My family really wants this relationship to work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. If a couple works hard at making their marriage work but find themselves incompatible, divorce is the best thing they can do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I am more comfortable thinking in terms of "my" things than "our" things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Giving something up for my partner is frequently not worth the trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. My family would not care if I ended this relationship.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. It is all right for a couple to get a divorce if their marriage is not working out.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I do not want to have a strong identity as a couple with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I get satisfaction out of doing things for my partner, even if it means I miss out on something I want for myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(Based on Stanley and Markman1992)

**Questionnaire 4** Couple# \_\_\_\_\_ (H / W) Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

A.	Always agree 5	Almost always agree 4	Occasionally disagree 3	Frequently disagree 2	Almost always disagree 1	Always disagree 0
1. Religious matters	5	4	3	2	1	0
2. Demonstrations of affection	5	4	3	2	1	0
3. Making major decisions	5	4	3	2	1	0
4. Sex relations	5	4	3	2	1	0
5. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. Career decisions	5	4	3	2	1	0

  

B.	All the time 0	Most of the time 1	More often than not 2	Occasionally 3	Rarely 4	Never 5
7. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. How often do you and your partner quarrel?	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. Do you ever regret that you married?	0	1	2	3	4	5
10. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves"?	0	1	2	3	4	5

  

C.	Everyday 4	Almost everyday 3	Occasionally 2	Rarely 1	Never 0
11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?	4	3	2	1	0

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

	Never	Less than once a month	Once or twice a month	Once or twice a week	Once a day	More often
	0	1	2	3	4	5
12. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas	0	1	2	3	4	5
13. Work together on a project.	0	1	2	3	4	5
14. Calmly discuss something	0	1	2	3	4	5

(Busby et al. 1995)

# A Christian Declaration on Marriage

November 14, 2000

As we celebrate the 2000th anniversary of the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ, entering the third millennium, we pledge together to honor the Lord by committing ourselves afresh to God's first institution-marriage. We believe that marriage is a holy union of one man and one woman in which they commit, with God's help, to build a loving, life-giving, faithful relationship that will last for a lifetime. God has established the married state, in the order of creation and redemption, for spouses to grow in love of one another and for the procreation, nurture, formation and education of children. We believe that in marriage many principles of the Kingdom of God are manifested. The interdependence of healthy Christian community is clearly exemplified in loving one another (John 13:34), forgiving one another (Ephesians 4:32), confessing to one another (James 5:16), and submitting to one another (Ephesians 5:21.). These principles find unique fulfillment in marriage. Marriage is God's gift, a living image of the union between Christ and His Church. We believe that when a marriage is true to God's loving design it brings spiritual, physical, emotional, economic, and social benefits not only to a couple and family but also to the Church and to the wider culture. Couples, churches, and the whole of society have a stake in the well being of marriages. Each, therefore, has its own obligations to prepare, strengthen, support and restore marriages.

Our nation is threatened by a high divorce rate, a rise in cohabitation, a rise in non-marital births, a decline in the marriage rate, and a diminishing interest in and readiness for marrying, especially among young people. The documented adverse impact of these trends on children, adults, and society is alarming. Therefore, as church leaders, we recognize an unprecedented need and responsibility to help couples begin, build, and sustain better marriages, and to restore those threatened by divorce.

Motivated by our common desire that God's Kingdom be manifested on earth as it is in heaven, we pledge to deepen our commitment to marriage. With three-quarters of marriages performed by clergy, churches are uniquely positioned not only to call America to a stronger commitment to this holy union but to provide practical ministries and influence for reversing the course of our culture. It is evident in cities across the nation that where churches join in common commitment to restore a priority on marriages, divorces are reduced and communities are positively influenced.

Therefore, we call on churches throughout America to do their part to strengthen marriage in our nation by providing:

- ✦ Prayer and spiritual support for stronger marriages
- ✦ Encouragement for people to marry
- ✦ Education for young people about the meaning and responsibility of marriage
- ✦ Preparation for those engaged to be married
- ✦ Pastoral care, including qualified mentor couples, for couples at all stages of their relationship
- ✦ Help for couples experiencing marital difficulty and disruption

‡ Influence within society and the culture to uphold the institution of marriage

Further, we urge churches in every community to join in developing policies and programs with concrete goals to reduce the divorce rate and increase the marriage rate. By our commitment to marriage as instituted by God, the nature of His Kingdom will be more clearly revealed in our homes, our churches, and our culture. To that end we pray and labor with the guidance of the Holy Spirit. May the grace of God, the presence of Christ, and the empowerment of the Holy Spirit be abundant to all those who so commit and be a blessing to all whose marriages we seek to strengthen.

*Bishop Anthony O'Connell,*  
Chairman, National Conference of Catholic Bishops,  
Committee on Marriage and Family Life

*Dr. Richard Land,*  
President, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission,  
Southern Baptist Convention

*Dr. Robert Edgar,*  
General Secretary  
National Council of Churches (Name withdrawn 11/17/2000)

*Bishop Kevin Mannoia,*  
President,  
National Association of Evangelicals