

Preferences for Emotional Dependence and Togetherness in Romantic Relationships:
The Impact of Cohort, Race, Gender, and Gender Ideology

Kacie L. Rowell

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Sociology

K. Jill Kiecolt
Anastasia S. Vogt Yuan
Minjeong Kim

November 18, 2011
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Emotional Dependence, Togetherness, Romantic Relationships, Gender, Relationship
Preferences

Preferences for Emotional Dependence and Togetherness in Romantic Relationships:
The Impact of Cohort, Race, Gender, and Gender Ideology

Kacie L. Rowell

ABSTRACT

This study investigates variation in preferences for mutual emotional dependence and togetherness in heterosexual romantic relationships among adults in the United States specifically considering the impact of race, gender, gender ideology, and cohort on preferences. A social structure and personality framework and concepts from exchange theory are used to interpret and predict relationship preference patterns found using binary hierarchical logistic regression analysis of data from the 1996 General Social Survey's (GSS) gender and emotions modules. Gender, gender ideology, cohort, and specific sociodemographic variables, such as education and marital status were found to impact preferences for mutual emotional dependence, however, no racially distinct patterns were found. The variables in the models explain less of the differences in preferences for togetherness than emotional dependence. However, education had a curvilinear relationship with preferences for togetherness, as people with the lowest and the highest educations were least likely to prefer togetherness.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical Perspective	3
2.1. Social Structure and Personality	3
2.2. Exchange Theory	4
3. Explaining Emotional Dependence and Togetherness.....	6
3.1. Gender	6
3.1.1. Gender and self-construal	6
3.1.2. Gender and emotional social support.....	7
3.2. Race.....	8
3.2.1. Race and support from kin and friends	11
3.3. Cohort Differences in Changing Views of Marriage and Relationship Expectations 11	
3.3.1. Cohort differences.....	12
3.3.2. Convergence of men’s and women’s relationship advice	14
3.3.3. Changing views of marriage	15
3.4. Gender Ideology.....	17
3.5. Control Variables	17
4. Data and Measures	19
4.1. Data	19
4.2. Measures	20
4.2.1. Dependent variables	20
4.2.2. Independent variables	20
4.2.3. Control variables	22
5. Analysis.....	23
6. Results	24
6.1. Sociodemographic Predictors of and Cohort Variation in Preferences	24
6.1.1. Emotional dependence.....	24
6.1.2. Togetherness	26
7. Discussion and Conclusions.....	28
8. References	39
9. List of Tables.....	43
Table 1: Hypotheses for Predicted Effects of Gender, Race, Cohort, and Gender Ideology on Preferences for Emotional Dependency and Togetherness in Relationships.....	43
Table 2: Deinstitutionalization of Marriage and Race-related Trends	44
Table 3: Changes in Relationship and Gender Ideology.....	45
Table 4: Means, Standard Deviations, and Descriptions for Variables in Sample	46
Table 5: Estimated Regression Coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) from the Binomial Regression of Emotional Dependence on Predictor Variables (n=941).....	47

Table 6: Estimated Regression Coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) from the Binomial Regression of Preferring Togetherness on Predictor Variables (n=934)..... 48

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate variation in preferences for mutual emotional dependence and togetherness in heterosexual romantic relationships among adults in the United States. Examining the possible influence of racial, gender, and ideological characteristics, and cohort effects provides a model illustrating the impact of socialization, personal experience, and intersectionalities, such as gender and race, on relationship expectations and preferences. I employ a social structure and personality framework and concepts from exchange theory to interpret and predict relationships preferences. Data from the 1996 General Social Survey's (GSS) gender and emotions modules is examined using hierarchical regression models.

Within the U.S. population, preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships are likely to vary. However, no sociological explanations for these possible variations have been formulated. While these preferences may seem like individual or personal decisions, larger (macroscopic) group patterns in preferences can reflect different collective/group understandings of what romantic relationships should be and should provide. If groups such as men and women differ about romantic relationship expectations, their relationships, generally, may not be as healthy or productive as if they had more similar expectations. Those who want emotional dependence or togetherness may feel dissatisfied and rejected by those who prefer less emotional dependence or less togetherness. Likewise, those who prefer emotional independence or less togetherness may feel pressured to engage in emotional work they do not wish to perform.

Identifying patterns in preferences is the first step towards understanding the possible implications of differing group expectations. Recognizing gendered patterns in preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships may further understandings of

gender dynamics in families or couples. Measuring preferences in relation to cohort may clarify how these dynamics/preferences are evolving in the U.S. population and also highlight how social conditions and time-specific norms may influence personal expectations. Identifying possible race-based differences or similarities in preferences for romantic relationship qualities could open up dialogue about the possible impacts of socialization of, and the structural conditions faced by, African Americans and whites and illuminate how these unmeasured influences may either impact people similarly or differently. Findings may necessitate increased awareness of the emotional needs of certain groups and possibly identify areas in the study of relationships where more research may be needed.

There is an abundance of theory and research on many aspects of heterosexual romantic relationships, such as on the relationship between marital status and mental health, or that of race and marriage patterns (Cherlin 2010; Reid 2004). However, preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in heterosexual romantic relationships have not been explained. My study considers the intersectionality of different social characteristics that may be related to preferred levels of emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships. I use a social structure and personality framework along with basic principles of exchange theory to predict possible relationships between social characteristics, past experiences, and personal attitudes. Identifying which factors predict different levels of preferred togetherness and independence in relationships may be useful in foreseeing incompatible expectations regarding relationships and may also be useful in identifying groups that may have more unmet emotional needs. This analysis also hopefully provides a better understanding of how social structure and social characteristics, along with experiences, may impact relationship preferences for mutual emotional dependence and togetherness.

2. Theoretical Perspectives

2. 1. *Social Structure and Personality*

This study used a social structure and personality (SSP) framework including principles of exchange theory to predict the possible influence of social structure, statuses, and past experiences in the development of attitudes towards emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships. Mutual emotional dependence, togetherness, and romantic relationship are all defined or interpreted using GSS question wording. A person is considered in a romantic relationship if he/she is married or has “a man/woman he/she thinks of as a steady, a lover, a partner, or whatever (Davis and Smith 1996).” Togetherness is defined as a person’s preference for doing most things in his/her social life with his/her significant other instead of pursuing separate interests. Mutual emotional dependence is not given a concise definition in the GSS questionnaire. However, other research has defined emotional dependence in a relationship as a state where both partners rely on each other for fulfillment of emotional needs such as the need to feel accepted, respected, loved, recognized, and understood (Attridge, Berscheid, and Spreche 1998). Using the SSP framework and exchange theory allows me to logically organize the possible relationships between larger macrostructures and the development of personal attitudes towards emotional dependence and togetherness (McLeod and Lively 2003). While I am not able to test the influence of all structural factors or the impact of exchange on respondents’ preferences, these concepts underlie many ideas for the possible development of group preference differences.

The SSP framework is used to organize the possible processes through which macrostructures shape proximate environments and may in turn influence individual attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors. The SSP framework assumes that people who occupy similar social

positions, based on social characteristics including race, age, education, gender, occupation, etc., will have similar opportunities and life experiences. These similar experiences and constraints or opportunities for action connect macro-level structures to the development of micro-level attitudes and behaviors (McLeod and Lively 2003). I use this framework when hypothesizing possible relationships between race, gender, age cohort, and preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships.

2.2. Exchange Theory

While the SSP framework outlines possible relationships between larger social structures, group experiences, and personal attitudes, exchange theory provides an additional rationale for the possible directions of these relationships. Processes of (and participation in) exchange may be incorporated into the SSP concept of proximal context. Proximal context refers to social structures and groups with which an individual interacts that may influence personal behaviors and attitudes. For example, macro-social structure may influence availability of (and participation in) exchange opportunities, which may then impact the development of personal attitudes and behaviors, including those toward relationships. Social relationships, including romantic relationships, are based on ties of mutual dependence. According to exchange theory, mutual dependence is characterized by both individuals in the relationship having some control or influence over the other's actions and "being in a position to, to some degree, grant or deny, facilitate or hinder, the other's gratification" or rewards (Emerson 1962: 32).

Exchange theory and power-dependence relations, as outlined by Emerson (1962), explain the dynamics of exchange in dyads that result in either balanced dependence and power or imbalanced dependence and power between individuals in the relationship. According to Emerson (1962), actor A's dependence on actor B increases the more A depends on B to provide

specific rewards or facilitate certain goals. The addition or presence of new or alternative relationships (sources of rewards) can impact the dependence-power relationship of the original dyad. If actors A and B both desire and depend on each other for emotional support and investment, and there are no other actors involved, the relationship is balanced. If actor A also has actor C as a source of emotional support and investment, actor A will depend less on actor B and the rewards provided by the relationship will not be as valuable or important to them. The value of the relationship will remain the same for actor B, making B more dependent on A than A is on B (an imbalanced relationship).

In this research study, exchange theory is foundational to hypotheses about possible gender and race related emotional preferences, but the direct influence of exchange relationships on preferences cannot be tested using the current data. Instead, I reinterpret the findings of prior social research on extended kin networks and the availability of (and reliance on) a primary confidant outside of marital or romantic relationships using exchange theory in order to predict preferences. I expect that gender and race may be related to availability of emotional support from sources other than a spouse or partner, which may impact preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships.

3. Explaining Emotional Dependence and Togetherness

3.1. Gender

3.1.1. Gender and self-construal. Gender has been linked to a number of personal characteristics which may impact preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in relationships. These include self-construals, expectations for the role of emotions in intimate relationships, and sources of emotional support. First, gender may impact preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness through its assumed relationship with self-construals. Self-construals refer to a person's view of, and beliefs about, themselves and what they should be in relation to others including whether they should be independent or interdependent (Cross and Madson 1997). People with independent self-construals tend to gain self-esteem and satisfaction from believing they are unique, special, or capable of succeeding when others cannot (Cross and Madson 1997). People with interdependent self-construals tend to gain self-esteem and satisfaction by emphasizing their connectedness to others, developing skills and behaviors that help them fit in, and sharing in collective or group accomplishments. These self-construal characteristics are also reflected in intimate relationships. Regardless of their self-construals, most people desire intimate relationships (Cross and Madson 1997). However, people with independent self-construals usually seek to maintain their autonomy and individuality within an intimate relationship, whereas people with interdependent self-construals tend to blur the boundaries between themselves and others.

In highly individualistic societies such as the United States, people tend to have more independent self-construals. Nevertheless, individualism tends to be more highly prized by advantaged groups than by disadvantaged and minority groups. For example, men generally develop more individualistic self-construals, while women generally develop more

interdependent self-construals (Cross and Madson 1997). Thus, women may prefer greater emotional dependency and togetherness in relationships than men do (Hypothesis 1A).

3.1.2. Gender and emotional social support. Gender may influence levels and availability of emotional support and companionship provided by friendships, which may impact preferences for emotional support and togetherness in romantic relationships. Women who are married or in romantic relationships generally have other close relationships, usually with other women that provide emotional support. For heterosexual men, romantic relationships with women are generally their primary source of emotional intimacy and social support (Booth 1972; Umberson, et al. 1996). Therefore, married men are more likely to report having their partner as their sole confidant than are married women (Booth 1972; Umberson, et al. 1996). Exchange theory implies that if men in general have only a spouse or partner as their primary confidant, the value of that relationship as a source of emotional and social support is greater than if alternative sources were available. The imbalance between women and men in the availability of emotional support, social support, and companionship outside of romantic relationships suggests that men will be more likely than women to prefer mutual emotional dependency and togetherness in romantic relationships (Hypothesis 1B).

On the other hand, studies of emotional disclosure and intimacy in friendship suggest no one uniform possible relationship between gender and emotional dependency and togetherness. Studies of women's and men's friendships, regardless of marital status, have shown mixed results about levels of emotional support and intimacy provided. Some studies of friendship find that women's same-gender friendships are more emotionally close than men's. Others, however, find there are no gender differences in overall levels of intimacy in same-sex friendships, once gender differences in expressing intimacy and emotions are taken into consideration (Clark and

Reis 1988; Cross and Madson 1997). For example, in friendships, women tend to talk about emotions and difficulties, whereas men tend to disclose less emotionally-charged information, especially about difficulties or hardships, and place more emphasis on shared activities (Cross and Madson 1997; Dindia and Allen 1992). Perhaps studies that have found that women have higher levels of emotional investment in friendships than men may ignore non-verbal forms of emotional expression and dependency, such as sharing activities. Focusing only on verbal forms of emotional investment may lead to results that under estimate men's emotional dependence in relationships.

In order to maintain personal feelings of autonomy, men may also redefine in terms of togetherness more than emotional closeness. In one study on the intimacy of same-gender friendships, men were found to use shared activities to bond, become emotionally close, and strengthen friendships, whereas women tended to use emotional sharing and talking (Caldwell and Peplau 1982). Men may be more likely to use these ways of bonding and emotional sharing because they are less threatening to independence and autonomy and still provide opportunities for self-disclosure and intimacy (Cross and Madson 1997). The pattern of men's preference for togetherness and women's preferences for verbal and emotional connections as primary characteristics of friendships may carry over into romantic relationships. Men may prefer togetherness in romantic relationships more than women do, while women may prefer emotional dependence more than men do (Hypothesis 1C).

3.2. Race

Race may impact preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness via the presumed importance of romantic relationships. Values and attitudes towards romantic relationships, along with household structure, may differ by race. The present study focuses on

possible similarities and differences between African Americans' and whites' attitudes based on social characteristics and socially-structured conditions that may influence interactions between men and women in romantic relationship thereby influencing attitudes, feeling, and behaviors towards romantic relationships.

Lower marriage rates and the relative instability of African American marriages may lower their preferences for emotional dependency and togetherness in romantic relationships. A number of different factors contribute to race-related relationship and marital trends. Structural factors, such as the higher unemployment and economic insecurity faced by African Americans as well as the higher incarceration rates of African American men, make it more difficult for African Americans to find suitable partners (Fossett and Kiecolt 1993). However, even after these factors are taken into consideration, whites are still significantly more likely to marry than African Americans, implying that a cultural element may also influence marriage patterns (Taylor 2010) (See Table 2 in the Appendix).

Both social structure and culture may influence the socialization of African American and white children, resulting in different expectations about romantic relationships. African American boys and girls may be taught to value more equality between partners and to have more egalitarian expectations about romantic relationships than white boys and girls (Cherlin 2010; Sharp and Ispa 2009). However, this does not mean that African American men and women share all roles and relationship expectations. For example, African American women report wanting to marry more than African American men do (South 1993). Comparatively more egalitarian socialization does not mean socialization that is completely the same by gender.

It is likely that different expectations of African American boys and girls, and subsequently men and women, have impacted African Americans' attitudes towards marriage

and relationships and may explain gender differences in the desire to marry. Because African American men with incomes and stability necessary to support a wife or family are scarce, African American women are taught that independence and taking care of themselves are imperative. Simultaneously, they are taught to believe that the ultimate achievement is to find a Black man who is willing and able to take care of them (Franklin 1986). The relative instability of relationships and marriages among African Americans, based on structural conditions that lead to difficulty finding suitable partners and possibly different relationship expectations, suggests African Americans may prefer emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships less often than Whites (Hypothesis 2A).

Desire to marry or reasons for being hesitant to marry may also reflect likelihood of preferring or not preferring emotional dependence and togetherness. Both African American men and women are less likely to desire to marry than white men and women. However, while the difference between African American and white women's desires are explained by educational attainment, men's differences are not (South 1993). White men expect marriage to have a more positive impact on both their friendships and sex lives than African American men do leading white men to rate marriage as more desirable and African American men to rate marriage as relatively less desirable (South 1993). If African American men have more negative views of marriage, they may also have more negative views of emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships. The possible association between more negative views of marriage and attitudes towards emotional dependence and togetherness would support the idea that African Americans will be less likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than whites (Hypothesis 2A). However, since African American and Whites women's desires to marry did not differ once educational attainment was considered, it is possible that once education is

controlled, African American and white women will not differ in preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness (Hypothesis 2B).

3.2.1. Race and support from kin and friends. Race also may be related to the availability of alternative sources of support, which could impact preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships. Historically, African Americans had larger kinship networks and a greater sense of interdependence than white Americans (Taylor 2010). Today, ties to a network of kin are still relatively more important than marital ties to African Americans than for whites (Cherlin 2010). However, recent findings about the importance of extended kin and friendship networks to African American and white families offer a more complex picture.

African Americans are more likely than whites to have extended kin living in their household; however, this does not necessarily mean that they have more alternative sources for support than whites do (Anderson and Allen 1984). Merely having extended kin in a household may not accurately represent the availability of emotional and social support provided by extended kin and other social networks. Kiecolt, Hughes, and Keith (2008) found that the two groups have similar levels of support from spouse or partner, kin, and friends. However, whites are more likely than African Americans to report their spouse is a confidant and African Americans are more likely to have a confidant other than their spouse or partner. While both groups have similar overall levels of support and strain from their spouse/partner, kin, or confidant, white men and women's greater likelihood of using their spouse/partner as a confidant supports the idea that white men and women may prefer emotional dependence and togetherness in their romantic relationship more than African Americans do (Hypothesis 2A).

3.3. Cohort Differences in Changing Views of Marriage and Relationship Expectations

3.3.1. *Cohort differences.* Preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in relationships may also differ by birth cohort. Members of cohorts who reach adulthood in different historical contexts or who are in different stages of life when major social changes occur will experience those changes differently (Percheski 2008). Over the past decades, family composition, relationship norms, and gender ideology have changed dramatically. Recent cohorts of women in the United States have experienced greater educational opportunities, more egalitarian gender-role norms, higher personal incomes, and employment. These changes have increased women's economic independence (Percheski 2008; Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001) and have been coupled with changes in individuals' attitudes about gender-related issues. Several researchers have found that egalitarian ideology has increased among both men and women in each successive cohort since the early 20th century (Brewster and Padvic 2000; Ciabattari 2001). As cohorts impact gender ideology, cohort-specific political and social environments may similarly impact preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness (Schnittker, Freese, and Powell 2003).

I will investigate possible attitude differences based on the three feminist cohorts that Schnittker, Freese, and Powell (2003) called political generations. The first cohort consists of people reached adulthood (when respondents were 18-27 years old) prior to 1963 (respondents aged 61+), prior to the peak of second wave feminism. I will refer to this group as the pre-second wave cohort. The second cohort consists of respondents who reached adulthood between 1963 to 1972 (respondents aged 41-60), during the peak of the second-wave feminist movement. I will refer to this group as the second wave cohort. The third cohort consists of respondents who reached adulthood after 1972, after the peak of the second-wave feminist movement (respondents aged 40 and younger). I will refer to this group as the post-second wave cohort.

Each of these cohorts has been exposed to different social and political conditions that may influence attitudes towards relationships. The first wave and beginning of the second wave of feminism that took place prior to the 1960s were foundational periods for women's rights. The first-wave feminist movement was both socially widespread and mainstream, and resulted in very significant foundational legislation, such as a women's right to vote. However, the peak of the second-wave feminism movement that took place from 1963 to 1973 is set apart by its many feminist and equal rights accomplishments and policies such as the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the enactment of Title IX in 1972, and *Roe v. Wade*. The period after 1973 is characterized by greater disagreement and factionalism within the feminist movement (Schnittker, Freese, and Powell 2003), less direct activism, and a strong upswing of antifeminist backlash (Davis and Robinson 1991). Because of this, those who reached adulthood prior to 1973 may have been more positively affected by the feminist movement than later generations.

Women who reached adulthood during the second wave were exposed to the most legislatively productive and unified feminism of the three waves. They are more likely to endorse egalitarian gender ideology and simultaneously identify as feminist than either earlier or later cohorts. This suggests that women who reached adulthood during the second wave may be more likely to connect feminist ideology of equality and independence to actual conditions of their life, including expectations for romantic relationships. Because of this, women who reached adulthood during the second wave may be less likely to favor emotional dependence and togetherness than women who reached adulthood in earlier or later cohorts (Hypothesis 3A). This hypothesis is partially supported further by research on the increasing similarities over the past decades of popular advice for men's and women's expectations of romantic relationships.

3.3.2. *Convergence of men's and women's relationship advice.* Hochschild's (2003) work offers another perspective on how gender may influence preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness. Hochschild (2003) conducted a content analysis of relationship advice books from the 1970s to 1990, arguing that the advice in these books reflects a time period-specific understanding of romantic relationship expectations and the qualities of these relationships that should be most valued. A decline in the relative weight of counseling provided by family members and church officials since the late 1980s has made these and other alternative sources of advice, such as professional television counselors who commonly host talk shows (for example, "Dr.Phil"), more important and influential (Hochschild 2003).

From the 1970s to 1990, some advice books encouraged men to become more emotionally open and "warm." However, traditional masculine culture that stressed the importance of men controlling emotions and emotional independence still predominated in all time periods. The advice for women over the decades was more dynamic. In the 1970s advice for women stressed the importance of emotional investment and avoidance of undermining patriarchal authority. In the early 1980s, a "no-needs woman" began to emerge as the model for women in relationships. There was a mix of earlier themes in some books, while in others women were advised to rely on themselves, avoid dependence by separating love and sex, and delay falling in love until the "right time." In the late 1980s, advice books continued to encourage women to be emotionally independent, cultivate hobbies, and participate in activities of personal interest. Hochschild's (2003) content analysis highlights a convergence between men's and women's romantic relationship advice. Over the decades, women have been progressively encouraged to become less invested in relationships and manage emotions in ways more similar to men (Hochschild 2003). Based on these trends, women who reached adulthood

during and after the late 1980s may be more likely to reject emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships than women who reached adulthood prior to the 1980s (Supporting Hypothesis 3A).

3.3.3. Changing views of marriage. The changing views of marriage that have been occurring over the past century may also contribute to cohort-based differences in preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness (Cherlin 2004). Cherlin (2004) argues that there has been a progressive deinstitutionalization of marriage occurring in the United States since the late 1940s. Deinstitutionalization refers to a weakening of social norms that define people's behaviors in social institutions, in this case, specifically marriage. He argues that these shifts can be seen in increasing cohabitation and divorce rates, percentages of children born to single mothers, and percentages of single-parent households (See Table 1 in Appendix).

Cherlin (2004) divides the proposed deinstitutionalization of marriage into three eras, each of which is characterized by a different set of attitudes towards romantic relationships and marriage that may impact preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness. The eras of institutionalized or mandatory marriage, companionate marriage, and individualized marriage have all been moving towards cultural redefinitions of marriage in individualistic terms. The era of mandatory marriage was predominant in and prior to the 1920s. It is defined by strict views that marriage is the only acceptable place for sexuality and children. While this era is important, there is limited availability of data on attitudes of people who reached adulthood during this era. Because of this, the eras of companionate and individualized marriage are most relevant to this research.

The era of companionate marriage dominated from the early 1950s to the end of the 1960s. This era was characterized by a fairly rigid gender-role division of labor. Yet husbands

and wives were both expected to be each other's friends, lovers, and general companions. Sentimental and emotional bonds within nuclear families were more heavily emphasized than before and love was seen as important, but not the most important contributor, to the success of marriages. In this era, emphasis on sentimentality and emotional bonds were not as critical to the definition of marriage as they would become during the era of individualized marriage that began in the 1970s and continues today.

During the era of the individualized marriage, relationships are expected to enhance personal fulfillment and provide emotional intimacy based on the beliefs that each person's autonomy should be respected and each person has a need and right for personal growth and change regardless of marital status. This belief in the right for personal growth and autonomy was reflected in the increasing acceptability of ending a relationship or divorcing because of "irreconcilable differences." This general statement of differences could indicate a number of circumstances, including that the relationship did not contribute to personal fulfillment. While intimacy and emotional dependency may be linked, they are separate concepts. Intimacy includes sharing emotions, feelings, and closeness, but does not necessarily imply dependency. The greater ability of people to leave relationships suggests that dependency is not as desired in this era as in others. The greater respect for and need of personal growth and development suggests that people may be more likely to prefer doing separate activities that interest them instead of doing most activities together than people who reached adulthood in earlier eras.

In light of this literature, I expect that people born before 1936 who reached adulthood during the era of companionate marriage (which coincides with pre-second wave cohort), will be more likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than those born between 1936 and 1955 (which coincides with the second wave peak cohort), who reached adulthood early in era of

individualized marriage (Hypothesis 3B). And I expect that people who reached adulthood early in the era of individualized marriage (which coincides with the second wave peak cohort) will be less likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than those who reached adulthood later in the era of individualized marriage (which coincides with the post-second wave cohort) (Hypothesis 3C). Both these changing views of relationships and the feminist generations outlined by Schnittker, Freese, and Powell (2003) have been influenced by the same historical contexts and follow a similar timeline of change (See Table 3).

3.4. Gender Ideology

Gender ideology refers to level of support for a division of paid work and family responsibilities that is founded on the idea of separate spheres for women and men (Davis and Greenstein 2009). Gender ideology may vary by both feminist generations/cohort and along the timeline of changes proposed in Cherlin's (2004) conception of the deinstitutionalization of marriage. However, gender ideology may also influence attitudes towards emotional dependence and togetherness independent of feminist generation/cohort. Gender ideology may impact preferences for emotional dependency and togetherness through its relationship to traditional values. People with more traditional gender ideologies may place a greater emphasis on mutual emotional dependence in relationships than those with less traditional gender ideologies (Hypothesis 4A). Due to the nature of traditional gender ideology founded on the idea of separate spheres, people with more traditional gender ideologies may be less likely to prefer togetherness than people with less traditional gender ideologies (Hypothesis 4B).

3.5. Control Variables

Other variables may also be related to or impact preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in relationships. Education may impact individuals' views of independence. By

increasing potential income, job opportunities, and consequently, ability to independently support oneself, higher education may decrease preferences for emotional dependency and togetherness in relationships. Total family income may influence outcomes through its relation to social class and possible financial dependency. In families with lower total family incomes, members may have more economic investment in each other for pooled incomes to meet subsistence levels and may have fewer opportunities to develop independent hobbies. This suggests a negative relationship between family income and preferences for emotional dependency and togetherness. However, in families in any income bracket, if one member provided significantly more income than another, the suspected relationship between family income and preferences may change. Because of this, percentage of total family income contributed by the respondent will also be included in the analysis. Marital and relationship status may impact preferences, because married people may be more likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than unmarried people. Likewise, those who are divorced or separated may be less likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness.

A majority of the hypothesized possible race-based and gender-based preference differences are based on concepts from exchange theory and availability of alternative sources of emotional support and companionship. Because of this, I included two measures of sociability: a measure of time spent socializing with friends and a separate measure of time spent socializing with relatives, based on number of times per week. Both of these variables will be included in the analyses.

4. Data and Measures

4.1. Data

Data from the 1996 General Social Survey's (GSS) gender and emotions modules were used for this analysis. The 1996 GSS used full probability sampling of households, which was designed to give each household an equal probability of being included in their sample.

However, only one adult per household was interviewed, so people living in larger households had lower probabilities of selection (Davis and Smith 1972-2008).

The 1996 GSS was administered to 2,904 non-institutionalized adults living in the United States. Of the total sample, about half (N=1,460) respondents were administered the emotions module. My analysis will include respondents who had valid responses to two questions that gauged preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness and multiple questions about gender ideology (N=1,411).

Characteristics of the analytic sample are shown in Table 3. The sample was 85.4 percent non-Black (including white respondents [96 percent] and respondents who identified as any other non-Black racial category [4 percent]) and 13.8 percent African American/Black. Men accounted for 43.5 percent of the sample; women made up the remaining 56.5 percent. Married people accounted for 48.6 percent of this sample. Never-married respondents who were not in a current romantic relationship accounted for 11.2 percent. Never-married respondents who were currently in a romantic relationship made up 11.6 percent of the sample. Previously married respondents who were not in a current romantic relationship made up 17.9 percent. Previously married respondents who were currently in a romantic relationship accounted for the remaining 10.4 percent. Respondents whose highest education was less than a high school diploma made up 14.5 percent of the sample. People who had completed a high school diploma accounted for 55.6

percent, 6.2 percent had completed an associate's degree, 16.4 percent had a bachelor's degree, and 7.4 percent had obtained a graduate/professional degree. The average age of respondents was 44 years, and the average annual total family income was \$36,400.

4.2. Measures

4.2.1. Dependent variables. Preference for mutual emotional dependence was measured by the question, "Would you prefer the type of relationship described in statement 1 or statement 2?: A relationship where the man and woman are emotionally dependent on each other. A relationship where the man and woman are both emotionally independent." Emotional dependence will be coded as a dummy variable with (1) preferring emotional dependence and (0) preferring emotional independence.

Togetherness was measured by the question, "Would you prefer the type of relationship described in statement 1 or statement 2?: A relationship where the man and woman do most things in their social life together. A relationship where the man and woman do separate things that interest them." Responses were coded as (1) preferring to do most things together and (0) preferring separate interests.

4.2.2. Independent variables. Gender was a dummy variable (female = 1, male = 0). Race was coded into two dummy variables, "Non-Black," which included all respondents who reported being a race other than African American/Black and "Black." Non-black was the reference category.

Cohort membership was based on a set of dummy variables that follows Schnittker et al.'s (2003) coding of political generations. Respondents were divided into three birth cohorts/political generations based on the years when they were 18-27 years old. The three cohorts were defined as prior to the second-wave peak, peak of second-wave feminism, and post-

peak of second-wave feminism cohorts. The pre-second wave cohort consists of respondents born prior to 1936, who reached adulthood prior to 1963 (ages 61+). The second-wave peak cohort includes respondents born from 1936 to 1955, who reached adulthood between 1963 and 1972 (ages 41-60). The post-second wave peak cohort consists of respondents born in 1956 or later, reaching adulthood after 1972 (ages <40). The second wave cohort was used as the reference category. Two interaction variables between gender and cohort were created to evaluate the presence of a multiplying effect of cohort and gender impacts, specifically with regards to being a woman and a member of the second wave cohort. The interaction variables female x pre-second wave and female x post-second wave cohort were created.

The feminist generation cohorts were also used to measure eras in the deinstitutionalization of marriage. The era of institutional/mandatory marriage, which dominated prior to the 1950s coincided most closely with the first-wave cohort. The era of companionate marriage and early individualized marriage coincided with the second-wave feminist cohort. The later era of individualized marriage coincided most closely with the post-second wave cohort.

Gender ideology was measured using two separate indicators of gender ideology. The first question, “do you agree or disagree...both the husband and the wife should contribute to the household income” had responses ranging from (5) strongly agree to (1) strongly disagree. The second question asked, “which type of relationship would you prefer? (1) A relationship where the man has the main responsibility for providing the household income and the woman has the main responsibility for taking care of the home and family. Or, (0) a relationship where the man and woman equally share responsibility for providing the household income and taking care the home and family.”

4.2.3. *Control variables.* Educational attainment, measured using dummy variables of the highest degree earned, included the following five categories—less than a high school diploma, high school diploma, associate’s degree, bachelor’s degree, and graduate/professional degree. Because high school graduates were the largest category and made up over fifty percent of respondents, they were used as the reference category. Total family income was measured in tens of thousands of constant (1986) U.S. dollars. Missing income data were imputed using the logistic regression equation based on the respondents’ age, sex, race, marital status, education, and employment status. Prior to imputation there were 315 cases with missing income data, after, there were no cases with missing income data (N=1,411). The percentage of total family income contributed by the respondent was computed by dividing personal income (in constant 1986 U.S. dollars based on reported and imputed income data) by total family income (in constant 1986 U.S. dollars) then multiplied by 100. In order to retain as many cases as possible, missing data for personal income were imputed using the same method as the imputation of missing total family income data. Marital and relationship status were measured by five dummy variables, “never married and not in a current romantic relationship,” “never married, has a current romantic relationship,” “previously married, has a current romantic relationship,” and “previously married, has no current romantic relationship,” and “married.” Married was the omitted category. Time spent socializing was measured by two ordinal variables, how often respondents spent time socializing with friends and how often the respondents spent time socializing with relatives. Responses to each question were (1) once per year or less, (2) several times a year, (3) one or more times per month (but less than multiple times per week), and (4) daily or multiple times per week.

5. Analysis

Binary logistic regression analysis was used to determine the impact of each independent variable and the race-gender and gender-cohort interactions on preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness, respectively. Emotional dependence and togetherness were significantly correlated (Pearson correlation=.150; sig \leq .000). However, a reliability test of how closely the emotional dependence and togetherness variables were associated indicated a very weak association. Because of this, the variables could not be used to create a composite variable. Instead, preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness were analyzed separately.

Each regression had six models. The variables in model 1 included marital status, education, family income, respondents' percentage contribution to total family income, and the measures of sociability. In model 2, the race and gender variables, female and black, were added. The cohort variables were added in model 3. The race-gender interaction, female x black, was included in model 4. The two gender ideology measures were added in model 5. The gender-feminist cohort interaction variable, female x second wave cohort, was included in model 6.

The feminist cohort variables were also used to determine the possible impact of Cherlin's (2004) proposed deinstitutionalization of marriage. The division of feminist cohorts, into the pre-second wave, second wave, and post-second wave generations, closely coincides with the institutional, companionate, and individualized eras of marriage. Because I measure both the impact of feminist cohort membership and the possible coinciding impact of the deinstitutionalization of marriage with the same variables, I am not able to separate out relative differences in influence. Instead, I am only able to conclude that any differences in preferences by cohort are the result of both changes in feminist cohort social and ideological context and concurrent changes in views and patterns of marriage and relationships.

6. Results

6.1. Sociodemographic Predictors of and Cohort Variation in Preferences

6.1.1. Emotional dependence. Model 1 was a base model that included all of the control variables: marital status, education, family income, respondent's percentage contribution to total family income, and the two measures of sociability. This first model explained approximately 2.5 percent of the variance in preferences for emotional dependence in relationships. This and subsequent estimates are based on the Nagelkerke R-square. Being previously married and not in a relationship was the only variable to significantly impact preferences in this model. People who were previously married and not in a current relationship were less likely to prefer emotional dependence in relationships than married respondents (see Table 5). Education, family income, respondents' percentage contribution to family income, and the measures of sociability did not significantly impact preferences.

In Model 2, the independent variables for gender and race, female and black, were added in addition to the control variables. In this model, gender and being previously married and not in a relationship were the only variables to have significant impacts on preferences. Women were significantly less likely than men to prefer mutual emotional dependence in romantic relationships. People who were never married and not in a current relationship were less likely to prefer emotional dependence than married respondents.

The cohort variables were included in Model 3. Their addition increased the explanatory power of the model to approximately 7.7 percent. In this model, being a woman remained significantly associated with a decreased preference for emotional dependence compared to men. In addition to the impact of gender, member of the post-second wave cohort were significantly more likely to prefer emotional dependence in romantic relationships than people who were

members of the second-wave cohort. There was no difference in preferences between members of the pre-second wave and the second wave cohorts.

In Model 4, the race-gender interaction variable was included. Gender, post-second wave cohort membership, and having never been married and not in a relationship, remained the only significant predictors of preferences for emotional dependence. The gender-race interaction variable, black-female, was not significant, and the addition of this variable did not increase the explanatory power of the model. As before, women were less likely to prefer emotional dependence than men. Likewise, people who were never married and not in a current romantic relationship remained less likely to prefer emotional dependence in relationships than married people.

Model 5 added the gender ideology measures. Only one was significant. Respondents who preferred relationships characterized by both partners equally sharing income and household chore responsibilities were significantly less likely to prefer emotional dependence than those who preferred the traditional male-breadwinner, female-homemaker model. The model explained approximately 11.2 percent of variation in preferences. The relationships between gender and preferences remained significant, as did cohort membership.

In Model 6, the interactions between gender and cohort, being female and a member of the pre or post-second wave cohort, were not significant and had little impact on the explanatory power of the model ($R\text{-square}=.113$). Women remained less likely to prefer emotional dependence than men. People who held more traditional gender ideologies remained more likely to prefer emotional dependence than those with more egalitarian gender ideologies. The significance of having never been married and not in a current relationship and membership in the post-second wave cohort were diminished.

6.1.2. Togetherness. In the logistic regression model for preferences for togetherness, Model 1 explained approximately 4.5 percent of the variance in preferences for togetherness. This was a base model that included only the control variables. Of these, marital status, education, and family income all had significant impacts on preferences for togetherness. People who were previously married and not in a current relationship were less likely to prefer togetherness than married people were. Respondents with less than a high school diploma and respondents with a graduate degree or higher were less likely to prefer togetherness than people with a high school diploma. Having a higher family income was associated with a slight decrease in preferences for togetherness. The decrease was .098 per \$10,000 unit increase in income. The sociability measures and respondent's percentage contribution to total family income had no impact on preferences (see Table 6).

The gender and race variables, female and black, were added in to Model 2. Neither variable had a significant impact on preferences. The impacts of marital status, education, and income on togetherness were unchanged from Model 1. In Model 3, the cohort variables were included. Members of both the pre- and the post-second wave cohort were significantly more likely to prefer togetherness than members of the second wave cohort. The model explained 6.3 percent of variance in preferences for togetherness. The impacts of education on togetherness were unchanged from model 2. The impact of income was slightly reduced from a decrease of .095 to .078 per \$10,000 income increase but remained significant. In addition to those who were previously married and not in a relationship, people who were never married and not in a relationship were also less likely to prefer togetherness than married respondents were. The gender-race interaction term was added in Model 4, and was not significant. Members of the pre- and post-second wave cohorts continued to be more likely to prefer togetherness than members

of the second wave cohort were. People who were never married and not in a relationship and people who were previously married and not in a relationship continued to be less likely to prefer togetherness than married people. Education continued to have a curvilinear effect on preferences for togetherness. People with the lowest and highest educations were both less likely to prefer togetherness than people with a high school diploma. A higher family income continued to be positively associated with preferences for togetherness.

Model 5 explained 8.3 percent of variation in preferences once the gender ideology variables were included. The only additionally significant relationship was between preference for a traditional over a more egalitarian relationship style. As expected, people who preferred more egalitarian relationships were less likely to prefer togetherness than those who preferred the traditional male-breadwinner, female-homemaker relationship. The relationships between preferences and all other variables remained the same except for education and cohort membership. In this model, only people with less than a high school diploma were significantly less likely than those with a high school diploma to prefer togetherness. Only members of the post-second wave cohort were more likely to prefer togetherness than members of the second wave cohort.

The final model, Model 6, added the gender-cohort interaction variables. Women members of the pre-second wave cohort significantly less likely to prefer togetherness. However, this contrasts the finding that being a member of the pre-second wave cohort and post-second wave cohort significantly increased likelihood of preferring togetherness compared to members of the second wave cohort.

7. Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this analysis was to examine the possible influence of race, gender, gender ideologies, and cohort effects on preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships. I have attempted to employ a social structure and personality based framework supported by the theoretical rationale of exchange theory, according to Emerson (1962), to explain possible patterned preference differences and similarities. The results of the regression analysis of this data have supported some of my hypotheses and contradicted others. The hypotheses were, for the most part, structured in a way that assumed a link between preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness, though they were to be evaluated separately. While the dependent variables were correlated with each other in a simple correlation, the impacts of the independent variables on preferences for each separate relationship characteristic were different. The models that evaluated preferences for emotional dependence were more successful at explaining variation in preferences than were the models for togetherness (though they contained the same independent variables). Even so, all of the models were significant and were able to account for at least a small amount of preference variation. The lower levels of explanation for preferences for togetherness may be due to the fact that 77.1 percent of respondents preferred doing activities and spending free time together instead of spending free time pursuing activities or hobbies that interest them separately (versus 22.9 percent). Preferring emotional dependence and preferring independence, on the other hand, occurred at more evenly divided rates (54.5 percent versus 45.5 percent). Because the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variables, emotional dependence and togetherness, were not uniform each dependent variable will require separate evaluation in relation to the hypotheses developed through the findings of previous literature.

The relationship between gender and preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness exemplifies the need for separate analysis of preferences for emotional dependence and preferences for togetherness, respectively.

Gender was found to have a significant relationship between preferences for emotional dependence, but had no significant impact on preferences for togetherness. While the impact of emotional dependence was significant, many of the gender-related hypotheses, including the expectation that women would be more likely than men to prefer emotional dependence in romantic relationships, were contradicted by the results of this analysis. The results suggest that women are less likely to prefer emotional dependence in romantic relationships than men. These results do not follow conventional logic or wisdom, contradicting the expectation that women would be more likely than men to prefer emotional dependence because they tend to have more interdependent self-construals (Hypothesis 1A). They suggest, however, support for the idea that men may have a lower availability of emotional support than women outside of romantic relationships, making them more dependent on romantic relationships (Hypothesis 1B).

I predicted that since men's preference for togetherness rather than sharing of emotions in friendships might carry over into romantic relationships (Hypothesis 1C). However, gender had no effect on preferring togetherness in romantic relationships. Similar to the impact of gender, the relationship between race and preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness did not necessarily follow expected patterns.

I had expected that based on the relative instability of African American relationships and marriages, founded in structural conditions that lead to difficulty finding suitable partners and possibly different relationship expectations, African Americans would prefer emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships less often than whites (Hypothesis 2A). I

had further expected that African Americans would be less likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness in relationships based on prior research about the association between race and negative attitudes towards marriage among men (Hypothesis 2A). Against these expectations, race had no significant impact on preferences for emotional dependence or togetherness. Some previous work on African American kin-networks found that African Americans are more likely to have extended kin living in their household and to have larger or more integrated kin networks (Taylor 2010; Anderson and Allen 1984). I was unable to test these claims; however, my findings suggest that even if African Americans had larger kin networks from which to draw social support, it is not reflected in race-based differences in preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness. In a separate analysis, I found that there were no significant differences between African Americans and whites in the amount of time they spent socializing with friends or with relatives (analysis not shown). This lack of significant differences in sociability may suggest that social support availability also does not differ significantly by race. This may help explain the lack of significant differences between African American and white preferences for either emotional dependence or togetherness.

Some prior research had found that Blacks were less likely than whites to have positive views of marriage. I had suspected that race-associated less positive views of marriage may translate into less desire for emotional dependency and togetherness, which are conventionally associated with marriage. In these prior studies, once education was controlled for, Black women and white women did not differ in their views. Because of this, I suspected that preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness would follow a similar pattern, with black and white women having similar preferences once education was controlled for (Hypothesis 2B). My findings partially support this hypothesis. African American and white women did not

significantly differ in preferences for either emotional dependence or togetherness before education was controlled for or when education was controlled for. These findings do not negate the reality of race-based relationship patterns and relative stability and instability; however, they do question the relationship between social structure and partner availability and relationship preferences. Despite racial differences in marriage rates, rates of single-parent households, and births outside of marriage, and average educational attainment, there were still no racial differences in preferences for emotional dependence or togetherness. Opportunity or lack of privilege may impact the possibilities for certain types of relationships (i.e. marriage, two-parent households, etc.); however, preferences concerning emotional dependence and togetherness may be unrelated to the prevalence of different relationship types.

Cohort was significantly related to preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in multiple models. Members of the pre-second wave cohort never had significantly different preferences than those in the second wave cohort in regards to preferences for emotional dependence. However, those in post-second wave cohort were significantly more likely to prefer both emotional dependence and togetherness than members of the second wave cohort. Unlike the effects of some of the other variables on preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness, cohort impacted both preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness in a similar way. Those who reached adulthood after the peak of the second wave feminist movement (the youngest respondents) were more likely than those who reached adulthood during the second wave to prefer both emotional dependence and togetherness. These findings supported the expectation that people who reached adulthood earlier in the era of individualized marriage (second wave cohort) would be less likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than those who reached adulthood later in the era of individualized

marriage (post second-wave cohort) (Hypothesis 3C). This finding only partially supported the hypothesis based on the work of Cherlin (2004) and the evolution of relationship and marriage norms through his classification of three main eras of marriage; the institutional, companionate, and individualized eras. Based on the outline of marriage eras developed in Cherlin (2004), I expected that people who reached adulthood during the era of companionate marriage (whose dates coincide with pre-second wave feminism cohort) would be more likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than people who reached adulthood early in the era of individualized marriage (whose dates coincide with the second wave cohort) (Hypothesis 3B). While there was no difference between members of the pre-second wave and second wave cohorts in regards to preferences for emotional dependence, there were differences in regards to preferences for togetherness. In three of the four models that included the cohort variables members of the pre-second wave cohort were more likely to prefer togetherness than member of the second wave cohort. It seems that a preference for togetherness may be more related to the ideological standards and expectations of individuals who reached adulthood during the era of companionate marriage. This is not wholly unexpected due to the emphasis on companionship and partners being expected to be each others' family, lovers, and friends. The emphasis on personal involvement with each other would be likely to include activity-based involvements described in the definition of "togetherness" used in this research.

The impacts of the interactions of cohort and gender were only significant in the model for togetherness. Being a female member of the pre-second wave cohort decreased likelihood of preferring togetherness in romantic relationships. This finding may reflect a greater difference in the preferences of men and women in this cohort than in other cohorts. Findings did not support the hypothesis that women who reached adulthood prior to the 1980s would be more likely to

prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than women who reached adulthood during or after the 1980s (Hypothesis 3A). The regression models also took into account the independent impacts of both cohort and gender ideology on preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness. Because cohorts were divided based on feminist political context it seemed possible that cohort membership and gender ideology would be very closely related. These two variables may have had the effect of cancelling out each others' significance in the models. However, even when gender ideology and cohort membership were included in the same models, each revealed independently significant impacts on preferences. This independent significant likely represents the variation in ideologies regardless of the political or feminist contexts or dominant ideologies of a time period.

Gender ideology related to the division of labor in heterosexual households was significantly related to preferences for both emotional dependence and togetherness. As expected, people who held more traditional beliefs with regard to the male-breadwinner, female-homemaker model of the family, were more likely to prefer both emotional dependence and togetherness (Hypothesis 4). The second measure of gender ideology measure was based on agreement that both men and women should contribute economically to a household. This measure had no significant impact on preferences for either emotional dependence or togetherness. While the first measure of gender ideology is based on preferences for a specific sex-based division of labor, the second measure seemingly indexes preference for an egalitarian relationship. However, it does not distinguish between having opportunities and rights to work in the paid labor force and the necessity of actual contributions. A person's belief in equal rights or more egalitarian relationships does not necessarily imply an agreement that both partners "should" work if one income is substantial or in the case of disability or other circumstances that

may limit participation in the paid labor force. Likewise, those who disagree with this statement may do so not because they believe that only men should contribute economically, but because they feel that both the man and woman should equally have the opportunity to contribute to the relationship through non-paid labor. All of the reasons may have contributed to the significance of one gender ideology measure and the lack of significance of the other.

The control variables in this analysis included education, total family income, respondent's percentage contribution to total family income, and marital and relationship status. Certain sociodemographic variables, such as education and marital status, had significant impacts on either emotional dependence or togetherness that were not uniform throughout the models. Other variables, including respondent's percentage contribution to total family income and the measures of sociability, had no impacts on preferences. While education had essentially no impact on preferences for emotional dependence, it did have a curvilinear associated with preferences for togetherness. People with the lowest and highest educational attainments were least likely to prefer togetherness in romantic relationships. There could be multiple explanations for this. One possibility is based on the tendencies of people with higher education to spend more of their young adult life single. More time as a single adult may provide individuals with more opportunities to cultivate independent interests and hobbies they are not willing to abandon later in life. It is interesting that having less than a high school diploma was also associated with a decrease in preferences for togetherness. It was found by Rubin (1976) that in working-class families, who would tend to have lower education, partners often spend less leisure time together than middle-class families. This happened because working-class partners usually devoted their "leisure" time to separate unfinished chores or other separate activities, whereas middle-class partners had the financial means and time necessary to go on outings

together (Rubin 1976). It is possible that preferences are based on internalization of this lived reality, but this is not the only explanation for preferences. It is also possible that people with lower levels of education are less likely to be in stable relationships and as a result may develop attitudes that are less favorable towards togetherness. Or, that the tendency of people with less education to hold more traditional gender ideologies may be related to beliefs that men and women should engage in separate leisure activities.

The relationship between marital and relationship status and preferences for togetherness followed a distinct pattern. The only significant differences were between those not currently in a relationship, regardless of previous marital status, and those who were currently married. Respondents “previously married, not in a relationship” and those who were “never married, not in a relationship,” were less likely than married people to prefer togetherness. Preferences for emotional dependence only significantly differed between those who were never married and not in a current relationship and those who were currently married. People who were never married and not in a relationship were less likely to prefer emotional dependence than married people were. The reason for the different impact of marital and relationship status on relationship preferences is not necessarily straightforward. People who are not in a current relationship may have no desire to be so. They may reject some component of a romantic relationship, possibly emotional involvement or time investment, though not necessarily dependency. If this were the case, they may be less likely to prefer dependence for the same reasons they choose to not be in a relationship.

As with any study, there are limitations. First, the definition of romantic relationships and the wording of the question used to measure preferences for emotional dependence limit conclusions that can be drawn from this analysis. The GSS regards a romantic relationship as

having “a man/woman [the respondent] thinks of as a steady, a lover, a partner, or whatever.” This leaves the definition open for wide range of interpretation. A person who has had a partner for ten years may be more similar to someone who is married than to a person who has had someone they consider a lover for six weeks. The non-specificity may weaken the association between relationship statuses and preferences. The broad category of being in a “romantic relationship” provides a good basis for beginning examination of preferences. However, if time and resources allowed, a more specific categorization of relationship type would be more desirable. Likewise, it is difficult to determine causality using the available categorical survey data alone. For example, it may be possible that people who do not prefer emotional dependence may be more likely to divorce. Or, people who experience a divorce may be more likely to reevaluate their preferences and subsequently prefer less emotional dependence in romantic relationships. Supplemental qualitative explanations or interviews would provide more support for establishing causality.

As for the measure of emotional dependence, the question “would you prefer the type of relationship where... the man and woman are emotionally dependent on each other? Or, a relationship where the man and woman are both emotionally independent?” sets up a binary for responses. A respondent can choose to be either dependent, or independent; and the foundational variable, “mutual emotional dependence,” holds a more negative connotation than other possible terms for emotional investment. A person may prefer mutual emotional investment in a relationship, but view or associate dependency negatively. Using a more neutral term such as “mutual emotional investment” or “mutual emotional involvement” may have produced different results.

Second, the measures of cohort are not divided along traditional generation lines, but along the frame of feminist activism. These feminism-based cohorts were rationally selected along the lines of specific political, social, and feminist contexts and were justified and used in prior research. Even so, it is possible that other political contexts that are not so related to feminism may influence individuals' preferences, which could impact the resulting relationships between feminist cohorts and preferences for emotional dependence or togetherness. And finally, while Model 6 as a whole is a significant model, collinearity between the pre-second wave cohort variable and the female X pre-second wave cohort interaction term may limit the interpretability or reliability of both individual predictors.

While this analysis did not support all of the hypotheses based on prior research findings, the results have provided a steppingstone for further research on preferences for relationship characteristics and understanding the impact of different sociodemographic variables on these preferences. The finding that women are less likely than men to prefer mutual emotional dependence in relationships opens dialogue for dismantling conventional wisdom that suggests women (presumably heterosexual) have greater desires for emotional investments (again, the wording of "dependency" making drawing conclusions troublesome) from their partners in romantic relationships. These findings also highlight incompatibilities between conventional definitions of masculinity, acceptable behavior, and men's supposed desires for autonomy and independence, and actual prevalence of men's preferences for emotional dependence. It is possible that men have unmet emotional needs and emotional expectations of romantic relationships that women are less willing to provide than conventional wisdom would suggest. Or framed in a different way, it may be that based on conventional ideas of gender roles, men have higher expectation of dependence between themselves and women than are reasonable.

More completely, these findings raise questions about the relationship between actual relationship patterns and preferred relationship types. At the same time, they leave open the option for further research that may increase the understanding and interpretability of the complex interactions between many social, structural, and demographic variables and the development and internalization of personal attitudes and preferences. A study that combines personal interviews that focus on relationship preferences and explanations of these preferences along with more quantitative survey data may be optimal for furthering these understandings. This type of research design may be especially helpful in furthering interpretability and understanding of some findings that were most unexpected. For example, the rationale behind and possible influence of social structure and internalization of gendered norms on men's increased likelihoods of preferring emotional dependence in romantic relationships and the implications of this preference could be investigated. Another avenue of research could focus more directly on how actual and preferred emotional dependence in relationships may differ or coincide between partners and how differences in gender preferences and reality may impact relationship power dynamics and resulting levels of egalitarianism or likelihood of relationship satisfaction.

References

- Acevedo, G. A. 2009. "Hispanics and Their Perceptions of Family Dynamics: An Extension and Test of Group Reference Theory." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 40:387-414.
- Anderson, K.L. and W. Allen. 1984. "Correlates of Extended Household Structure." *Phylon* 45:144-157.
- Attridge, M., E. Berscheid, and S. Sprecher. 1998. "Dependency and Insecurity in Romantic Relationships: Development and Validation of Two Companion Scales." *Personal Relationships* 5:31-58.
- Beeghley, Leonard, E. Wilbur Bock, and John K. Cochran. 1990. "Religious Change and Alcohol-Use - An Application of Reference Group and Socialization Theory." *Sociological Forum* 5:261-278.
- Booth, Alan. 1972. "Sex and Social Participation." *American Sociological Review* 37:183-192.
- Brewster, Karin L. and Irene Padavic. 2000. "Changes in Gender Ideology, 1977-1996: The Contributions of Intracohort Change and Population Turnover." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:477-487.
- Caldwell, Mayta A. and Letitia. Anne Peplau. 1982. "Sex-Differences in Same-Sex Friendship." *Sex Roles* 8:721-732.
- Cherlin, Andrew J. 2004. "The Deinstitutionalization of Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:848-861.
- , 2010. *Public & Private Families*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Ciabattari, Teresa. 2001. "Changes in Men's Conservative Gender Ideologies-Cohort and Period Influence." *Gender and Society* 15:574-591.

- Clark, Margaret S. and Harry T Reis. 1988. "Interpersonal Processes in Close Relationships." *Annual Review of Psychology* 39:609-672.
- Cross, Susan E. and Laura Madson. 1997. "Models of the Self: Self-Construals and Gender." *Psychology Bulletin* 122:5-37.
- Davis, James Allan and Tom W Smith. 1972-2008. "General social surveys." National Science Foundation. --NORC ed.-- Chicago: National Opinion Research Center [producer]; Storrs, CT: The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut [distributor]. 2009.
- Davis, Shannon N. and Theodore N. Greenstein. 2009. "Gender Ideology: Components, Predictors, and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35:87-105.
- Dindia, Kathryn and Mike Allen. 1992. "Sex Differences in Self-Disclosure: A Meta-Analysis." *Psychology Bulletin* 112:106-124.
- Emerson, Richard M. 1962. "Power-Dependence Relations." *American Sociological Review* 27: 31-41.
- Fossett, Mark A. and K. Jill Kiecolt. 1993. "Mate Availability and Family-Structure Among African-Americans in United-States Metropolitan-Areas." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:288-302.
- Franklin, Clyde W. 1986. "Black male-Black female conflict: Individually caused and culturally nurtured." Pp. 106-113 in *The black family*, edited by R. Staples. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Harnois, Catherine E. 2005. "Different Paths to Different Feminisms? Bridging Multiracial Feminist Theory and Quantitative Sociological Gender Research." *Gender and Society* 19:809-828.

- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 2003. "The Commercial Spirit of Intimate Life and the Abduction of Feminism: Signs from Women's Advice Books." Pp. 13-29 in *The Commercialization of Intimate Life*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Kiecolt, K. Jill, Michael Hughes, and Verna M. Keith. 2008. "Race, Social Relationships, and Mental Health." *Personal Relationships* 15:229-245.
- McLeod, Jane D., and Kathryn J. Lively. 2003. "Social Structure and Personality." Pp. 77-102 in *Handbook of Social Psychology* edited by John Delmater, New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Marshall, Tara C. 2008. "Cultural Differences in Intimacy: The Influence of Gender-Role Ideology and Individualism-Collectivism." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 25:143-168.
- Percheski, Christine. 2008. "Opting Out? Cohort Differences in Professional Women's Employment Rates from 1960 to 2005." *American Sociological Review* 73:497-517.
- Reid, Anne. 2004. "Gender and Sources of Subjective Well-Being." *Sex Roles* 51:617-629.
- Rubin, Lillian. 1976. "The Quality of Leisure." Pp. 185-204 in *Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working-Class Family*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Sarkisian, Natalia and Naomi Gerstel. 2004. "Kin Support among Blacks and Whites: Races and Family Organization." *American Sociological Review* 69:812-837.
- Schnittker, Jason, Jeremy Freese, and Brian Powell. 2003. "Who are feminists and what do they believe? The role of generations." *American Sociological Review* 68:607-622.
- Sharp, Elizabeth A. and Jean M. Ispa. 2009. "Inner-City Single Black Mothers' Gender-Related Childrearing Expectations and Goals." *Sex Roles* 60:656-668.

- South, Scott J. 1993. "Racial and Ethnic Differences in the Desire to Marry." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 55:357-370.
- Taylor, Ronald L. 2010. "Diversity within African American Families." Pp. 419-442 in *Family in Transition*, edited by A. S. Skolanick and J. H. Skolanick. Boston, MA: Pearson Higher Ed.
- Thornton, Arland and Linda Young-DeMarco. 2001. "Four Decades of Trends in Attitudes toward Family Issues in the United States: The 1960s through the 1990s." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63:1009-1037.
- Umberson, Debra, Meichu D. Chen, James S. House, Kristine Hopkins, and Ellen Slaten. 1996. "The Effect of Social Relationships on Psychological Well-Being: Are Men and Women Really SO Different? " *American Sociological Review* 61:837-857.

List of Tables

Table 1: Hypotheses for Predicted Effects of Gender, Race, Cohort, and Gender Ideology on Preferences for Emotional Dependency and Togetherness in Relationships

Gender
1A. Women may be more likely to prefer emotional dependency and more likely to prefer togetherness in relationships than men are.
1B. Women’s greater access to emotional support, social support, and companionship outside of romantic relationships suggests that men will be more likely than women to prefer mutual emotional dependency and togetherness in romantic relationships.
1C. The pattern of male preference for togetherness over emotional closeness in friendships may carry over into romantic relationships. Men may prefer togetherness in romantic relationships more than women do.
Race
2A. The relative instability of African American relationships and marriages, based on structural conditions that lead to difficulty finding suitable partners and possibly different relationship expectations, suggests that African Americans may prefer emotional dependence and togetherness in romantic relationships less often than whites (This hypothesis is additionally supported by research on support provided by extended kin networks. White men and women’s greater likelihood of using their spouse/partner as a confidant supports the idea that white/non-black men and women may prefer emotional dependence and togetherness in their romantic relationship more than African Americans do)
2B. Since there is no difference in African American and white/non-black women’s desire to marry once educational attainment is controlled, there will likewise be no significant differences between African American and white women in preferences for emotional dependence and togetherness when education is controlled.
Cohort
3A. The cohort (of women) who reached adulthood during the second wave of feminism may be less likely to favor emotional dependence and togetherness (than women) who reached adulthood in earlier or later cohorts.
3B. People who reached adulthood during the era of companionate marriage (which coincides with pre-second wave feminist cohort) will be more likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than those who reached adulthood early in the era of individualized marriage (which coincides with second wave cohort).
3C. People who reached adulthood early in the era of individualized marriage (which coincides with the second wave cohort) will be less likely to prefer emotional dependence and togetherness than those who reached adulthood later in the era of individualized marriage (post-second wave feminist cohort).
Gender Ideology
4A. People with a more traditional gender ideology will prefer mutual emotional dependence in relationships more often than those with less traditional gender ideologies.
4B. Due to the nature of traditional gender ideology founded on the idea of separate spheres, people with a more traditional gender ideology will prefer togetherness in relationships less often than people with less traditional gender ideologies

Table 2. Deinstitutionalization of Marriage and Race-related Trends

Indicators of Deinstitutionalization and Racial Disparities	African Americans	Whites	Total
Percentage of young women who will ever marry	88% in 1950→ 66% in 2000s	95% in 1950s→ 92% in 2000s	
Percentage of children born to unmarried mothers	38% in 1970→ 70% in 2006	6% in 1970→ 27% in 2007	
Percentage of households headed by one parent	36% in 1970→ 53% in 2007	10% in 1970→ 19% in 2007	
Percentage of unmarried men and women cohabiting			4% in 1978 → 9.5% in 1998
Probability of divorce in lifetime			18% in 1920→ 50% in 2002

(Casper and Bianchi 2010; Cherlin 2010)

Table 3. Changes in Relationship and Gender Ideology

	1900-1920s	mid-1920s-1960s	mid-1960s-mid-1970s	mid-1970s-1980s	mid-1980s-1900s
Deinstitutionalization of Marriage	Era of Institutional/Mandatory Marriage: Marriage viewed as only acceptable place for sex and children.	Companionate marriage dominates: breadwinner-homemaker family model. Partners expected to share sentimental bonds. Divorce rates low, marriage still widely viewed as necessary for having sex and for childbearing.	Early Individualized	Later Individualized	Individualized Marriage: Median age for first time marriage rose to all-time highs for both men and women. Cohabitation and childbearing outside of marriage more acceptable. Personal fulfillment and emotional intimacy are viewed as primary for, if not requirements of, romantic relationships. High divorce rates. Lack of personal fulfillment now grounds for divorce, rise in "no-fault divorce." Same-sex unions find greater acceptance.
Feminist Cohort Effects	First-Wave Feminist Cohort	Second-Wave Feminist Cohort: characterized by anti-discrimination movements and liberalism of equality.		Post Second-Wave Feminist Cohort: Feminist ideology has become more mainstream and more separated from feminist roots. More egalitarian ideology about specific equal rights issues is present, but endorsement of egalitarian ideology is not viewed as completely necessary.	
Popular Romantic Relationship Advice		Advice books were warm, stressing the importance of emotional investment in romantic relationships. Patriarchal values dominate: men should lead, women obey; women benefit from patriarchy. It's a woman's job to keep marriage happy and it's mainly her fault if it's unhappy.		Advice books cool, if you live your own life fully then you will eventually find a relationship that is powerfully emotional and fulfilling. A mix of themes, some stress the importance of remaining emotionally detached, others stress the importance of emotional investment.	Avoid getting too emotionally involved in romantic relationships. Remain independent and you will be safe and happy in relationships.

(Hochschild 2003; Schmitter, Freese, and Powell 2003; Cherin 2004)

Table 4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Descriptions for Variables in Sample

Variable	Range	Mean	SD
Respondents prefer emotional dependence	0 (no) to 1 (yes)	.45	.50
Respondents prefer togetherness	0 (no) to 1 (yes)	.77	.42
Age	18 to 71 years	44.6	16.63
Female		0.57	0.50
Black		0.14	0.35
<i>Birth Cohort</i>			
Pre second-wave cohort member; born in or before 1936 (age 60+)		0.21	0.41
Second-wave cohort member; born between 1937-1955 (ages 41-59)		0.32	0.47
Post second-wave cohort member; born between 1956-1978 (ages 18-31)		0.47	0.50
<i>Gender Ideology</i>			
Prefer male breadwinner-female homemaker family model	0 (no) to 1 (yes)	0.59	0.91
Both men and women should contribute to economically to families	0 (yes) to 1 (no)	0.68	0.47
<i>Marital Status</i>			
Married		0.47	0.55
Never married and not currently in a relationship		0.11	0.32
Never married and not currently In a relationship		0.12	0.32
Previously married and not currently in a relationship		0.18	0.38
Previously married and currently in a relationship		0.10	0.31
<i>Education</i>			
Less than high school diploma		0.14	0.35
High school diploma		0.56	0.50
Associates degree		0.06	0.24
Bachelors degree		0.16	0.37
Graduate degree		0.07	0.26
Respondent's percentage contribution to family income	4.76 to 100	32.60	11.35
Total yearly family income in 10,000 U.S. Dollars	0.5 -7.5+	3.64	2.17
<i>Time Spent with Social Network</i>			
Time spent with relatives	1 (never) to 7 (almost daily)	4.55	1.61
Time spent with friends	1 (never) to 7 (almost daily)	4.16	1.61

Table 5. Estimated Regression Coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) from the Binomial Regression of Emotional Dependence on Predictor Variables (n=941)

Independent Variable	Model 1 (††.025)	Model 2 (††.064)	Model 3 (††.077)	Model 4 (††.077)	Model 5 (††.112)	Model 6 (††.113)
Female	-□-	-.739*** (.140)	-.763*** (.141)	-.795*** (.150)	-.781*** (.153)	-.820*** (.250)
Black	-□-	-.052 (.200)	-.029 (.201)	-.192 (.331)	-.150 (.337)	-.150 (.337)
<i>Cohort (Second Wave Peak Cohort)^o</i>						
Pre-second wave	-□-	-□-	.294 (.204)	.298 (.204)	.201 (.209)	.342 (.315)
Post-second wave	-□-	-□-	.518** (.170)	.518** (.170)	.536** (.172)	.436 (.247)
Black x Female	-□-	-□-	-□-	.254 (.410)	.278 (.416)	.278 (.416)
<i>Gender Ideology</i>						
Prefer male-breadwinner, female homemaker relationship model (1=yes)	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	.393*** (.081)	.391*** (.081)
Believe man and woman should contribute economically to household (1=yes)	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	.024 (.159)	.022 (.159)
Female x Pre-second wave cohort	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	-.231 (.405)
Female x Post-second wave cohort	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	.174 (.317)
<i>Marital and Relationship Status (Married)</i>						
Never married, not in a relationship	-.396 (.230)	-.476* (.235)	-.585* (.240)	-.592* (.241)	-.498* (.244)	-.473 (.245)
Never married, in relationship	-.180 (.233)	-.209 (.240)	-.368 (.249)	-.374 (.249)	-.211 (.253)	-.192 (.253)
Previously married, not in a relationship	-.419* (.194)	-.282 (.198)	-.199 (.205)	-.206 (.205)	-.195 (.209)	-.155 (.212)
Previously married, in relationship	-.085 (.239)	-.107 (.243)	-.073 (.245)	-.067 (.245)	.047 (.251)	.053 (.251)
<i>Education (High School Diploma)</i>						
Less than high school diploma	.398 (.207)	.353 (.211)	.372 (.215)	.363 (.215)	.375 (.219)	.366 (.220)
Associate's degree	-.318 (.283)	-.269 (.287)	-.295 (.290)	-.297 (.290)	-.256 (.292)	-.258 (.293)
Bachelor's degree	-.225 (.190)	-.181 (.194)	-.202 (.196)	-.203 (.196)	-.217 (.199)	-.222 (.199)
Graduate degree	.096 (.247)	.081 (.253)	.145 (.255)	.145 (.256)	.207 (.259)	.194 (.259)
Family income	-.009 (.030)	-.027 (.030)	-.014 (.031)	-.014 (.031)	-.006 (.032)	-.006 (.032)
Respondent's percentage contribution to total family income	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
<i>Time Spent with Social Network</i>						
Time spent with relatives	.041 (.042)	.057 (.042)	.053 (.043)	.052 (.038)	.038 (.046)	.037 (.033)
Time spent with friends	-.016 (.043)	-.025 (.044)	-.040 (.045)	-.038 (.045)	-.036 (.049)	-.033 (.046)

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

† $p < .05$ (one-tailed test)

†† Nagelkerke R Square

^oOmitted categories in parentheses.

Table 6. Estimated Regression Coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) from the Binomial Regression of Preferring Togetherness on Predictor Variables (n=934)

Independent Variable	Model 1 (††.045)	Model 2 (††.047)	Model 3 (††.060)	Model 4 (††.063)	Model 5 (††.083)	Model 6 (††.097)
Female	-□-	.174 (.167)	.161 (.168)	.073 (.179)	.107 (.180)	.483 (.273)
Black	-□-	.066 (.241)	.106 (.243)	-.310 (.366)	-.276 (.370)	-.239 (.376)
<i>Cohort (Second Wave Cohort)^a</i>						
pre-second wave	-□-	-□-	.499* (.244)	.507* (.244)	.426 (.247)	1.366** (.435)
post-second wave	-□-	-□-	.507* (.199)	.505* (.199)	.515* (.202)	.683** (.280)
Black x Female	-□-	-□-	-□-	.699 (.484)	.716 (.488)	.680 (.493)
<i>Gender Ideology</i>						
prefer male-breadwinner, female homemaker relationship model (1=yes)	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	.349** (.104)	.335*** (.105)
Believe man and woman should contribute economically to household (1=yes)	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	.046 (.189)	.015 (.190)
Female x Pre-Second Wave Cohort	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	-1.485** (.515)
Female x Post-Second Wave Cohort	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	-□-	-.315 (.367)
<i>Marital and Relationship Status (Married)</i>						
Never married, not in a relationship	-.521 (.270)	-.516 (.272)	-.608* (.278)	-.626* (.279)	-.551* (.281)	-.521 (.285)
Never married, in relationship	-.359 (.285)	-.364 (.288)	-.499 (.302)	-.516 (.303)	-.388 (.306)	-.376 (.309)
Previously married, not in a relationship	-.507* (.229)	-.584* (.232)	-.508* (.239)	-.526* (.239)	-.519* (.241)	-.439* (.247)
Previously married, in relationship	-.284 (.294)	-.287 (.295)	-.236 (.297)	-.219 (.298)	-.132 (.301)	-.107 (.304)
<i>Education (High School Diploma)</i>						
Less than high school diploma	-.516* (.239)	-.511* (.240)	-.544* (.245)	-.570* (.246)	-.584* (.248)	-.620* (.251)
Associate's degree	.082 (.368)	.066 (.369)	.056 (.370)	.050 (.371)	.076 (.372)	.016 (.373)
Bachelor's degree	-.410 (.219)	-.419 (.220)	-.419 (.222)	-.420 (.222)	-.434 (.224)	-.461* (.226)
Graduate degree	-.602* (.275)	-.598* (.276)	-.545* (.278)	-.544* (.278)	-.512 (.280)	-.549 (.283)
Family income	-.098** (.034)	-.095** (.034)	-.079* (.035)	-.079* (.035)	-.073* (.035)	-.072* (.035)
Respondent's percentage contribution to total family income	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
<i>Time Spent with Social Network</i>						
Time spent with relatives	.066 (.050)	.062 (.050)	.058 (.050)	.055 (.050)	-.041 (.051)	.044 (.051)
Time spent with friends	-.011 (.052)	.015 (.052)	.005 (.053)	.013 (.054)	-.016 (.054)	.020 (.055)

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

† $p < .05$ (one-tailed test)

†† Nagelkerke R Square

^a Omitted categories in parentheses