Alberto Mascena

THE RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES AMONG MIXED ITALIAN COUPLES: A PSYCHOSOCIAL APPROACH

Abstract

Starting from the results of 33 interviews conducted over two years with 11 mixed couples who live in Italy, this study explore through a psychosocial perspective the role of religious differences in a "mixed" couple's relationship. We emphasizes the importance of interaction and negotiation within the couple, relativizing the role of religion as a monolithic "idea". We also pay attention to the social dimension within which the partners live and build their own experience as a couple. We suggest also theoretical and practical perspectives that can allow a better understanding of this phenomenon, in order to structure an approach that is sensitive to the real characteristics of these unions.

Keywords

About the author

Clinical and Social Psychologist / Specialized in Systemic-Relational Psychotherapy, he has been dealing with Ethnopsychology and migratory phenomenon for several years. He conducted research-intervention projects in Africa (Senegal and Togo) with the aim of exploring the psycho-social dynamics related to migration. Currently his research is continuing within the Department of Human Sciences for the "Riccardo Massa" training of the University of Milan-Bicocca. He is adjunct professor in Social Psychology at the University of Milan-Bicocca. He mainly deals with ethnopsychology and social psychology of migration, with particular attention to sub-Saharan emigration to Italy, the phenomenon of mixed couples and families, and the topic of collective trauma.

Contact: mascenaalberto@gmail.com

Socioscapes. International Journal of Societies, Politics and Cultures

211

Introduction

In Western societies, multiculturalism has been a well-established reality for several decades. The idea of the nation as a homogeneous group of people who share the same traditions, values, and beliefs now belongs to the past; ideas, commodities, and people can now travel and meet with an intensity and a frequency until recently unimaginable (Appadurai 2012, 2014; Zamperini and Mascena 2016).

The migration phenomenon has assumed a structural importance in recent years, and in the countries of Mediterranean Europe, especially in Italy, human migration is radically changing the traditional social structure. Within this framework there are several innovative aspects: such as new relational patterns between migrants and indigenous people that are slowly redefining the social landscape, and also new forms of social cohesion which are developing. In light of this mixed unions represent the most intimate interaction between different social and cultural groups (Gevrek 2014).

This phenomenon is a "total social fact" (Sayad 2004), as it includes both macro-social and psycho-social issues. Mixed unions, in fact, suggests us how society is transforming, and which are the new ways in which families are being built (Tognetti-Bordogna 2001, 2015). Furthermore mixed unions show us new possible ways of making differences coexist, especially socio-cultural differences, and how new generations manage to held together different religious istances in a unified personal identity.

Some authors have noticed a considerable increase in these kinds of unions in several countries (Leslie, Bethany, and Letiecq 2004; Troy, Lewis-Smith, and Laurenceau 2006). For example, Passel (2010) found that these unions have had a significant impact in the US (from 6.8% in 1980 to 14.6% in 2008).

Even in Europe, the phenomenon is now well established (Rodriguez-Garcia 2006; Tognetti-Bordogna 2001, 2015), although we notice a significant difference between countries with a long history of migration (England, France, Belgium, and Germany) and countries of southern Europe (Italy, Spain, and Portugal). In Italy, mixed unions are a relatively recent phenomenon (Andolfi et al. 2011; Tognetti-Bordogna

2001, 2015). According to Istat data, in 2014 mixed weddings accounted for more than 17,500, representing 9.2% of marriages in Italy, and 10% of celebrated weddings in the same year in the north. The Eurispes 2015 data show a further increase in these celebrations: 20,764 in total. Furthermore, Eurispes has developed a prediction that mixed marriages will be around 35,807 by 2030. Finally, in 2013, 28,989 children were born to mixed couples.

Before addressing the issue of religious difference, it is a priority to define what are the main features of a "mixed" couple. In the first section of this paper, we will clarify the concept of "mixed union" and "religious difference", starting from a perspective that refers to the social environment and the relational dynamics of the couple. The adopted perspective is the psychosocial one, through which it is possible to explore both the intimate relationship between the two partners and the social context. We use this approach because it's useful in order to highlight the micro and meso dimensions of this reality. With this framework we can underline, on the one hand, the intimate dimension of the couple and the construction of its daily practices, and on the other hand the relationship of the couple with the social context, together with the type of construction that society builds concerning the idea of a mixed couple. In fact, according to the literature, the otherness of the mixed couples is closely related to the image that other people build around them. This perception may also be influenced by the media, that build specific ideas related to migration and minorities (Bleich et al. 2015).

The concept of mixed union

The encounter between people with different cultural, religious, ethnic, and social origins generates new social realities in which we can find different resources and constraints that involve not only the couple and the family, but also the families of origin and a wider social context.

Although we already have quite a few studies about this phenomenon, it's still a difficult task to define what a "mixed" couple is. As already pointed by Gaia Peruzzi (2008, 16):

"The semantic content of the expression "mixed union" isn't often explained by authors. As we dive into the possible meanings of this subject we notice how it is only at a superficial level that the definition it's intuitive and immediate".

Many studies have chosen to investigate mixed couples from a theoretical perspective that highlights the importance of the sociocultural context within which these relationships take place (Keeney 1982; Auerswald 1985; Killian 2001). Individuals are not "monads" isolated from each other, but embedded systems within the broader sociocultural structure, which influences their daily values, beliefs, meanings, and practices. This allows us to identify the microsystem (the couple that creates "us"), the mesosystem (the family, "a more inclusive us"), the ecosystem (the family of origin, the community, "us and them"), the macrosystem (society, "us and the world"), and the system of chronology (time, "us and life") (Bronfenbrenner 1994). Between all these systems there is always a two-way relationship.

Lautman and Bensimon (1977) proposed the definition of mixed relationship by emphasizing the social interaction between the couple and the cultural context. Religious, cultural and ethnic differences are crucial, since they cause a reaction in the social context, and that's what contribute to create a mixed couple. The focus here is placed on the perception of "diversity" experienced by the social actors who see mixed couples as a novelty. Two kinds of consideration can be made upon this definition: the point of view of the observer is crucial (Streiff-Fenart 1994; Gozzoli and Regalia 2005), and the sense of self is manifested through the interaction between personal identity, cultural and social factors (Karis and Killian 2009). "Race", culture, ethnicity, and religion become social categories built and "held up" by intersubjective agreement; they do not seem to have an intrinsic meaning themselves, instead they develop through social interaction and in close contact with the historical, political, and geo-cultural context. Which of these concepts becomes relevant in defining the mixed union depends, essentially, on a creative act, mostly unconscious, and always in close contact with the "spirit of time" (*zeitgeist*) and the specific geographic location.

Cottrell (1990) showed the absolute importance of the social context. Until the 1930s, interracial unions were the most debated topic; while in the 1940s, the attention of the public eye shifted toward interreligious unions; in the 1950s, society was more focused on international unions; and finally, from the 1980s onward, social studies addressed the theme of interethnic unions where we find that cultural, ethnic, and religious differences occur simultaneously.

In Italy, the most salient cultural dimensions are culture and religion. This is because of very precise historical and political reasons, linked to both the recent migratory flows, the role of the church, and the Catholic religion. In this sense, the mixed term mostly identifies intercultural and interreligious couples.

The management of religious differences

A couple's story it's a script written by two people, in which the resulting screenplay is given by the way personal, social, cultural differences meet and to what extent they are managed, coordinated and reciprocally enhanced. In light of the above, the resulting harmony or disharmony between the couple originates and it's being kept by the partner's capacity to manage to actively do something with their differences.

Among the differences, those related to the religious dimension are often the most discussed ones. For example, speaking of Italian-Muslim couples, Allievi (2006, 8) states that "this marriage is the one that arouses the most attentive interest, sometimes in an even morbid way, both in the press and in religious instances". This is because Islam generates a sense of fear in today's society, and mixed couples with a Muslim partner can trigger adverse reactions from the social context. The integration of Muslim religious people is definitely an important issue (Statham and Tillie 2016).

Often the religious difference in the couple can trigger strong relational difficulties which may involve both partners and children, which can often be trapped between two different cultural and religious worlds. Religion is, in fact, an important identity dimension, which becomes even more relevant in mixed unions. This is especially true for the migrant partner,

as religion represents the connection with their personal world. of values, origins, and family.

The reciprocal connection between migration, religion and family has made weddings between partners with different religious confessions an interesting perspective to investigate the transformations that are occurring in the religious panorama and the relation between people and religious institutions. The intersection between faith, culture and ethnicity in mixed families is the focus of several qualitative researches in different national contexts (Ata 2003; Bangstad 2004; Arweck and Nesbitt, 2010; Cerchiaro et al. 2015; Cerchiaro 2016). These studies has shown how the tendency is to "customize" the religion and to detach it from religious institution of affiliation, by creating new ways to interpret and manage the religious pluralism inside the family context. These processes includes the modalities through which partners try to find, in everyday life, balance between the religious practices and beliefs of their backgrounds, sometimes stepping away from their respective religious confessions, other times by choosing to adopt one religion (for example through the conversion of one of the two partners), and in other situations by experimenting forms of syncretism and spirituality beyond the binary affiliation to one religion or the other (Arweck and Nesbitt 2010; Cerchiaro et al. 2015; Cerchiaro 2016).

What has been said so far prompts us to ask us a few questions: how can these differences be managed within the relationship? Will they represent a contentious issue or, will they be renegotiated in order to create new and more harmonious relational patterns? Speaking of cultural differences, some authors have highlighted that some of the characteristics can also be applicable for religious differences. For example Seshadri e Knudson-Martin (2013, 44) detected that "when two or more cultures intermix through marriage or a significant relationship, questions surface as to how stories and traditions "should be" followed and how differences will be addressed" .

According to Snyder (1987, 250), the continuity of the relationship "depends on the ability of the couple to effectively face the tensions inherent the maintenance of a shared and individual identity at the same time" Some couples seem to face this tension by giving up, individually or jointly, "portions

of their own family history or their ethnic identity" (251). The opposite strategy is to keep their respective religious traditions, in order to implement their mutual integration. Falicov (1995, 234) introduced the concept of "mutual acculturation" to show how the process of acculturation is reciprocal, mutual, always bidirectional, and also inevitably involves both the foreign partner and the "native" one. Considering the position of the migrant partner within the couple, Rodriguez-Garcia (2006) proposed the concept of transcultural identities in which the person embraces the values and meanings of both cultures, the original one and the culture of the hosting country, including the values system of the partner. Sayad (2004) also spoke of transnational identities.

However, as suggested by Bacigalupe (2003), one of the risks for the couple is to succumb to the pressure of cultural assimilation by the foreign partner or it can happen that in other situations, the migrant partner will want to keep a strong identification with his or her native culture, without making any effort to approach the partner's culture. We also witness situations in which the migrant partner tends to reject both cultural systems, his/her own and the partner one, becoming in this way what we may call a "cultural homeless" (Vivero and Jenkis 1999). Finally, the migrant partner may develop a combination of positions, depending on the degree of involvement in the relationship (Bacigalupe 2003).

Mixed unions are characterized by different meanings and values that affect both the couple and the social context in which they live their daily lives. They are engaged in a marriage that is carried out in a wide negotiation between different cultures and values, in an activity of decoding words and experiences, a reconciliation of visions that are often very different and which requires a greater investment by the partners, both with respect to the relationship dynamics of a couple and with respect to society.

Mixed unions are introducing new ways to connect and to structure highly articulated roles which require a strong personal investment from both partners. That is why they need more social support than others, as they are implicitly asked to come to terms with the delicate task of combining their differences and several dimensions to make the "marriage work"

(Tognetti-Bordogna 2001, 2015). However, mixed unions also represent a great opportunity not only for the individual and the couple, but also for families, society in general, the nations, and their respective religions. They are in fact, the most intimate form of interconnection between different "worlds" within which we can see how the differences can meet and interact with each other (Tognetti-Bordogna 2001).

Method and participants

The participants are 11 mixed couples who live in Italy, with different cultural, educational, and professional backgrounds. The interviews focused on couple's narrative about religion, cultural and social differences, how they negotiate divergent cultural and religion beliefs and practices, and their views on childrearing about cultural and religion education.

Among the participants, 8 couples are married, 3 are engaged. The couples were chosen after getting in touch with several cultural organizations and associations who deal with intercultural issues and the migratory phenomenon (see Table 1 at the end of article).

We conducted 33 interviews articulated as described below: an interview with the couple together, plus an individual interview with each partner. All interviews have been recorded and transcribed. The interview focused on the following dimensions:

• The personal and family history of each partner;
• The couple's story;
• The relationships between the couple and their original families;
• The role of religious and cultural differences;
• The relationship with children.

Results

By presenting the results of our interviews we will also show some excerpts from the interviews to highlight the more relevant characteristics of the couples, their problems and potentialities, and the ways they have found to manage their religious differences.

An important dimension that engages the couple since the beginning of their story is the one related to perceptions that family have about the migrant partner. Often, the Italian partner may anticipate a certain degree of fear and rejection from his family toward the migrant partner. Families often seems to believe that a couple composed by two people from different sociocultural or religious origins is an intrinsically problematic relationship. This premise may be associated with an even more prejudicial idea, as it was for the case of A. and M. M, who, being a Muslim, is perceived as a bearer of an even higher level of complexity and potential problems:

> I: You said that your mom didn't have a very good opinion about your relationship in the beginning …
> A: Yes, she didn't, mostly because he isn't graduated, he's a Muslim and didn't have a steady job. Part of the problem is he didn't have a degree like I do, and also because my mother has a cousin who's married to an Egyptian man who left her alone with their daughter since he unexpectedly went back to his country. My mother is also a lawyer, so she said that she often sees many cases of mixed couples where they got divorced, they fought for the children's custody, or some cases where the father runs away with their children …
>
> (A: 29, Italy, woman) - (M: 27, Morocco, man)

In another interview between L and A, we also see the issue of the lack of trust from the Italian's original family. The problem seems to be related to the religious beliefs of the foreign partner, as well as to their ethnic and cultural origin:

> L: In the beginning, there was a lot of mistrust, because of the important religious differences between us, so I wanted my family to get to know him better.
> A: There is something your father said: Your parents wanted a normal wedding.
> L: Yes, it's true. My aunt told me that she would have wanted a normal marriage for me. According to my aunt, a normal marriage is a marriage between two of the same "race".

I: So now that the two of you have a son ...
L: We are fools!

(L: 43, Italy, wife) - (A: 35, Burkina-Faso, husband)

Religion, can play a crucial role in the construction of the bond with the partner's families; instead the religious affiliation can be easier to live within the couple, since partners, who are busy making a new family, can have an higher degree of freedom in negotiating their ideas. On the other hand, religious rules tend to be more rigid and prescriptive when the couple is dealing with the families of origin.

I: What about your religion? Are you a practicing muslim?
A: From the religious point of view there's a dialogue, we always talk with each other about it, I'm interested in her religion, also because I'm not a churchgoer. Problem is, he doesn't want me to meet his family yet, because we're not already married.
S: If I would introduce her to my family, it wouldn't be a good thing. Cause I can't be engaged, there's no such thing as "engagement" in my religion. I can only introduce to my family one woman, the one I'm marring.

(A: 28, Italy, women) - (I: 36, Nigeria, man)

In the beginning when a new couple is forming, each partner brings to the relationship a certain idea about what roles, behaviors, attitudes, responsibilities, and what tasks partners are required to do. These characteristics now need to be renegotiated and discussed with the partner, who has, in turn, his/her own ideas on what building a relationship means. During this process, the couple may encounter some difficulties and various problems, whose resolution may sometimes coincide with the construction of a universe of shared meanings. This means partners are able to set up and share a common point of view, which they use to live and interpret the relationship, choose an educative style for the children, and the family way of life. This is the case of L and K, a pair of Italo-Indians,

who have found their relational balance between their religions:

L: The Asian world is a totally different world from ours, since they are raised with much more discipline. They are also taught to take good care of their things and they have a very strong relationship with their family, and much respect for marriage. The relatives are very important and present in their lives, which can cause strong conflicts, especially in the beginning.
K: Yes, he didn't realize that he couldn't go out with his friends every night at first, that he had to change. For me, when you get married you're supposed do all the things together, with the family, and you can't go out and be on your own anymore.
I: From this point of view the two of you must have felt a strong cultural gap, at least in the beginning ...
L: I was initially fascinated by these things because I never had a real family. Then we started this religious journey as Jehovah's Witnesses, at first in Italian and then we switched to the Sinhalese language. This has allowed us to have common ideas about everything, because the path we've chosen gives you some guidelines on the education of the children, about marriage, about everything really. So now we can also teach our children about the Sinhalese culture.

(K: 46, Sri-Lanka, wife) - (L: 48, Italy, husband)

This example also shows us another interesting different management strategy. As we can see, L has in fact, decided to learn the native language of his wife and to start a religious path together in the Sinhalese language. Sharing the same religion and language can allow the partners to feel closer and help them form a relationship in which each partner can feel valued and legitimized.

Some of the difficulties that partners can encounter in raising their children may emerge when the religious dimension interconnects with gender roles. In fact, the point of view of each partner about what it means to be a man /women and male/female can also be built through the lenses of religion, which can

sometimes represent, for one partner or the other, one of the most salient value's dimension within which the kind of education to give to children can be settled.

It is in this frame that the conflict between A.and M.,a young italo-moroccan couple, arise.

I: How do you deal with the religious differences?

A: I think it will become a problem when we'll have children

M: I do too. We always say it, I have to tell you this upfront because I'm not kidding. I believe it will become an issue since I often hear her say things like "My children will choose, will do this and do that and so on." No, I want my children to be Muslims.

A: I, on the other hand, would love for my children to be free to choose, either the mother's culture and religion, or the father's one ... that's it, for me they are free to choose for themselves. I would never force my daughter to wear the hijab if she doesn't want to. Instead, when it comes to circumcision I would be more favorable because of health reasons ....

M: Yes. I would love my daughter to wear the hijab. Because the hijab is a protection for women, it's a protection for women…Because here you hear about a lot of violated women, they say that they're free of doing whatever the hell they want to,I apologise for my language. It's because of this, cloche, fashion, it all starts when you're a kid, all the cut up cloche, the kid gets used to grow with that kind of style. He wear sit when he's little and he grows, and grows and grows and then he come to an age in which he feels free to walk like that in front of all the people. That's why other people do things like this too, they think that this is normal, that this is the best, which is not. Do you see? That's why I say that.

A:But this is not what it means to be muslim, it means to be good parents. I grew up well, I've worn mini skirts, but I didn't get raped, nor does it means that I'm a bad person..my parents aren't muslims.

(A: 29, Italy, woman) - (M: 27, Morocco, man)

However, the choice of religious education can, if appropriately coordinated and discussed, be conveyed to children in an harmonious way. This happens when the dialog is open and when communication takes place assertively without either of them hiding their own needs and their "parental" mandate:

Z: It's something that I've clarified since the beginning. I'm a Muslim so for me it's normal and also important, to teach my daughter my religion and show her my path, but I do not care about integralism. I don't care about political issues, I simply don't. I'm doing my best for my religion, but I'm not interested in convincing others.

L: Exactly. I'm okay with religion if it's a personal thing, otherwise if it becomes a political matter, then it also becomes a problem.

Z: Exactly. I'm faithful, but it's a personal thing, and that's enough. I don't care what other people do.

L: Also, I have never been particularly interested in teaching a specific religion to my daughter. I have and like my own spirituality, which is not really Catholic, but I have it.

(L: 35, Italy, woman) - (Z:34, Egypt, man)

It is possible for the migrant partner to spontaneously give up his/her religion. This can happen especially if there is a strong and urgent need of integration into a new and unknown social context. This is what happened to F and S. S is a woman from Mozambique, a nation which is characterized by a strong religious syncretism between Christians and Muslims. When she arrived in Italy, S (who is Muslim), felt the need to become Christian to give her children a greater chance of integration in the new social context, since it was the religion of the host country:

S: So, I thought that if I wanted to give my children a religious education, I had to become a Christian. Since as a Muslim, it would have been very difficult for me here. How would it have been possible for me and my children, at school and with the teachers? Instead, by being here I realized it was a better choice for me to make. Plus, I already wanted to change religion... it made much more sense for me to become a Christian.

I: So, you opted for this solution essentially for your children's care, for school, since it was the simplest thing to do.

S: I already was intrigued by the Christian religion…and between my husband who was already catholic and all that stuff you know..

I: All right, ok.

A: You know, living in Italy, if I want to give a religious education to my children, I had to make this conversion, how would I have done if I stayed a Muslim? with my kids and all of that, instead staying here..let's say that I already did wanted to make this conversion and be a Christian.

F: She grew up in contact with both Christian and Muslim religion, in Mozambique the religion choice is more flexible, and she has done it for the kids, to have the same religion that they would have learned in school.

(S: 58, Mozambique, woman) - (F: 62, Italy, man)

Discussion

This study shown that in a mixed couple's daily life religious differences represent one of the most challenging issues to discuss and manage. The couple is constantly engaging in this delicate task of being able to combine different values, traditions, and educational trends, which can sometimes collide (Killian 2001; Tognetti-Bordogna 2001; Bacigalupe 2003; Cerchiaro 2016).

It is very clear that a mixed couple's life is characterized by a continuous tension between the inside, represented by the couple's relationship and the outside, which is embodied by the original families and the social community.

What is important to state and emphasize in this context is that having different religions does not always equal emotional and cognitive distance within the couple. This is particularly true when partners do not anchor themselves rigidly to their own values and religions; what is crucial is, how these differences are used and discussed. Therefore, there is no univocal way to relate to one's own religion and to negotiate it with the partner. The relationship with the social context in which the couple lives can produce, in fact, different repercussions within the relational dynamics. Identification with religion to which people have been socialized does not represent an immutable heritage, but a part of one's identity that changes in daily interaction and within one's own personal biographical trajectory (Saint-Blancat 1999). For instance, Cerchiaro (2016, 45) found the following three main discourses on religion:

"The feeling of religious identity discussed in the couple, the management of religious practices and the decisions taken on the religious education of children. These three discursive domains represent the symbolic arena within which one relates one's relationship with religion in everyday family life. In this space the couple creates different forms of interaction aimed at redefining the various identities".

One of the biggest problems we have encountered in our interviews is what we can call the "culturalization of the problem": when a mixed couple has difficulties, partners (and often the extended social context, made up of friends, family of origin, community) tend to interpret these difficulties as an effect of religious differences, cultural or ethnic, thus colluding with the dominant narrative that interprets these relationships as a "hazard", destined for failure because they break the endogamic rule. As underlined by Rodriguez-Garcia (2006, 426) about the relational problems of mixed couples in Catalonia:

"Although often seen in terms of a cultural incompatibility", which can lead to a 'clash of civilizations' discourse, the conflicts that arise are due more to socio-economic, situational and personal factors than cultural differences, or at least to a combination of factors, and point to the need for an argument to counter culturalists' explanations which favor the processes of essentialization (Werbner and Modood 1997)."

Moreover, these couples often fear conflict and disharmony because these factors risk being interpreted by the social community as a tangible sign of the

senselessness of their relationship, and by the partners as the disruptive effect of differences belonging to religious and cultural universes. and social ones that are too distant, and therefore not very compatible. This interpretative system therefore also affects the level of agency of the partners and the resolution of the problem, which sometimes can't count on the support of other significant people (first of all the family). Like any other couple, even mixed couples would have the "right" to experience problems, and to interpret these difficulties as natural events occurring within the experiential cycle that involves both partners.

Often it is within the religious education of children that the importance of religious difference emerges. As Alotta (2000, 283) states: "The most important challenge seems to be the religious and cultural identity of the children, but also their own. In any case, the object of negotiation is always the identity that the couple wants to build" . The religious identification of the children, however, does not depend only on the choices of the parents, but also on the social field in which they grow up (Peggy et al. 2011).

We know that in mixed unions partners often have to work more on their relationship in order to find what works for them, as they feel a higher social pressure from the environment in which they live in.

The couple's harmony is mostly based on how much both partners can feel represented and validated within the relationship. The relationship should include the personal and cultural dimensions of both partners, with the use of a comprehensive logic ("and ... and") and not an exclusive one ("or ... or"). This allows the couple to build an "intercultural" relationship that draws energy from other's differences.

A mixed couple could therefore be compared to a social laboratory in which may anticipate the society's future, and in which it is possible to experience intercultural practices that may contribute to creating new ways of living and building relationships. In fact, one of the biggest challenges for mixed couples is to find a way to combine each other's differences that have a higher level of complexity on a cultural level. On the other hand, as Todd (1994, 12) reminds us:

The rate of exogamy, the proportion of marriages made by immigrants, their children or grandchildren with members of the host society, is the ultimate anthropological indicator of assimilation or segregation. In a way it opposes the truth of relations with that of political and ideological indicators.

However, the connection between mixed marriages and the level of integration is a more complex issue. (Song 2009).

Religion, as well as culture or ethnic origin are useful dimensions of meaning, because they reduce the complexity of the phenomenon, and help us to define some peculiarities of the different ways of "doing" a mixed couple. However, they can't exhaust the complexity and variety of the "history" of these couples. As Benhabib (2002) reminds us, having a specific cultural origin means experimenting with traditions, rites, stories, rituals and symbols, instruments and material conditions of life through shared narrative accounts, but also challenged and contestable. We believe that this idea can also apply to religion, a dimension that is constantly discussed, challenged and negotiated by partners.

References

Allievi, S. 2006. "Cosa Vuol Dire "Coppie Miste"? In "*Sposare l'altro. Matrimoni e Matrimoni Misti nell'ordinamento Italiano e nel Diritto Islamico*, edited by Zillo-Grandi, 11-41. Venezia: Marsilio.

Alotta, S. 2000. "Identità e confronto interreligioso nei matrimoni misti." In *Immigrati e religioni, edited by* M. I. Maciotti, 277-287. Napoli: Liguori.

Andolfi, M., A. Mascellani , and A. Santona. 2011. *Il Ciclo Vitale Delle Coppie Miste: Un'altalena Tra Culture*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Appadurai, A. 2012. *Modernità In Polvere*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Appadurai A. 2014. *Il Futuro Come Fatto Culturale*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Arweck E. e Nesbitt E. 2010. "Close encounters? The intersection of faith and ethnicity in mixedfaith families", *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 31 (1): 39-52.

Ata, A.W. 2003. *Christian-Muslim Intermarriage in Australia: Identity, Social Cohesion or Cultural Fragmentation*. Melbourne: David Lovell Publishing.

Auerswald, E. H. 1985. "Thinking About Thinking In Family Therapy." *Family Process* 24 (1): 1-12.

Bacigalube, Ed. D. G. 2003. "Intercultural Therapy With Latino Immigrants and White Partners." *Journal of Couple and Relationship Therapy* 2 (2-3): 131-149. doi: 10.1300/J398v02n02_10.

Bangstad S. (2004), "When Muslims marry non-Muslims: marriage as incorporation in a Cape Muslim community", *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 15 (3): 349-364.

Benhabib, S. 2002. *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bleich E., I. Bloemraad and E. de Graauw. 2015. "Migrants, Minorities and the Media: Information, Representations and Participation in the Public Sphere." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41 (6): 857-873.

Bronfenbrenner, U. 1994. "Ecological Models Of Human Development." In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3): 37-43. Oxford: Elsevier.

Cerchiaro F., S. Aupers, and D. Houtman. 2015. "Christian-Muslim Couples in the Veneto region, northeastern Italy: Dealing with religious pluralism in Everyday Family Life." *Social Compass* 62 (1): 43-60.

Cerchiaro, F. 2016. *Amori E Confini: Le Coppie Miste Tra Islam, Educazione Dei Figli E Vita Quotidiana*. Napoli: Guida.

Cottrell A. B. 1990. "Cross-National Marriages: a Review of the Literature." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 21 (2): 151-169.

L'Eurispes.it. "Indovina chi Viene a Cena? L e coppie miste in Italia." Consultato il 05/05/2019. https://www.leurispes.it/indovina-chi-viene-a-cena-le-coppie-miste-in-italia/

Falicov, C. J. 1995. "Trining to think culturally: a multidimensional Comparative Frame Work." *Family Process* 34 (4):373-88.

Gevrek, D. 2014. "Interracial Marriage, Migration and Loving." *The Review of Black Political Economy* 41 (1): 25-60.

Gozzoli, C., and C. Regalia. 2005. *Famiglie e Migrazioni*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Istat-report (2014). "Il Matrimonio in Italia.*"*

Karis, T. S., and K. D. Killian. 2009. *Intercultural Couples: Exploring Diversity in Intimate Relationship*. New York: Routledge.

Keeney, B. 1982. *Aesthetics of Change*. New York: Guilford.

Killian, K.D. 2001. "Reconstituting Racial Histories and Identities: The Narratives Of Interracial Couples." *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 27 (1): 27 – 42.

Lautman, F., and D. Bensimon. 1977. *Un Mariage, Deux Tradition: Chrétiens et Juifs.*. Bruxelles: Editions de l'Universitè de Bruxelles.

Leslie, L. A., Bethany, and Letiecq. (2004). Marital quality of african american and White Partners in Interracial Couple. *Personal Relationships* 11 (4): 559–574.

Song, M. 2009. "Is Intermarriage a Good Indicator of Integration?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (2): 331-348.

Statham, P. and J. Tillie. 2016. "Muslims in Their European Societies of Settlement: a Comparative Agenda for Empirical Research on Socio-Cultural Integration Across Countries and Groups". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (2): 177-196.

Passel, S. 2010. Interracial marriages at an all-time high, study says, interview by Stephanie Chen. CNN: International Edition

Peggy, L., K. Lucken, and M. Barnett. 2011. "Beyond Home and Return: Negotiating Religious Identity across Time and Space through the Prism of the American Experience." *Mobilities* 6 (4): 467-482.

Peruzzi, G. 2008. *Amori Possibili: Le Coppie Miste nella Provincia Italiana*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Rodriguez-Garcia, D. 2006. "Mixed Marriages and Transnational Families in the Intercultural Context: a Case Study of African-Spanish Couples in Catalonia." *Journal of Ethnic and Migrations Studies* 32 (3) 403-433.

Saint-Blancat, C. 1999. *L'Islam in Italia. Una presenza plurale* Roma: Edizioni Lavoro.

Sayad, A. 2004. *The suffering of Immigrants*. Translated by David Macey. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Seshadri, G., and Knudson-Martin, C. (2013). "How Couples Manage Interracial and Intercultural Differences: Implications for Clinical Practice." *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 39 (1): 43-58.

Snyder, S. 1987. "Love making: a Symbolic Interactionist Approach to the Experience of Love Among Unmarried Heterosexual Young Adult Couples". PhD. Diss., (Doctoral dissertation). New York: Syracuse University.

Streiff-Fenart, J. 1994. "Problemes de Terminologie et Ambiguite de la Notion". In *Cultures Ouvert, Societes Interculturelles: du Contact a L'interaction,* edited by C. Labat and Vermes, G., 226-232. Paris, L'Harmattan.

Todd, E. 1994. "*Le Destin des Immigre´s. Assimilation et se´gre´gation dans les de´mocraties occidentales.*" Paris: Seuil.

Tognetti-Bordogna, M. 2001. *Legami Familiari e Immigrazione: I Matrimoni Misti*. Torino: L'Harmattan.

Tognetti-Bordogna, M. 2015. *I Matrimoni Misti: Verso la Società Plurale*. In L'Italia e le Sue Regioni. Roma: Istituto Edizioni Treccani.

Troy, A.B., J. Lewis-Smith, and J. Laurenceau. 2006. "Interracial and Intraracial Romantic Relationship: the Search for Differences in Satisfaction, Conflict, and Attachment style." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship* 23 (1): 65-80.

Vivero, V. N., and S. R. Jenkins. 1999. "Existential Hazards of the Multicultural Individual: Defining and Understanding "Cultural Homelessness"." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 5 (1): 6-26.

Zamperini, A., and A. Mascena. 2017. "Study Like Italians do" as a Migration Project: Field Research in Togo." *Journal of Ethnography and Education* 12 (3): 271-293.

Socioscapes. International Journal of Societies, Politics and Cultures

221

Table 1. Participants

ID	Nationality	Years of relationship	Migrant partner	Partner's age		Children	Education degree	Occupation
1	Italy-Egypt	5	Man	M: 34	W: 35	1	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Employee W: Accountant
2	Italy-Argentine	4	Man	M: 46	W: 37	/	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Worker W: Employee
3	Italy-Sri Lanka	20	Woman	M: 48	W: 46	2	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Nurse W: Chef
4	Italy-Mozambique	31	Woman	M: 62	W: 58	1	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Manager W: Employee
5	Italy-Benin	6	Man	M: 42	W: 36	2	M: University degree W: University degree	M: Employee W: Teacher
6	Italy-Morocco	4	Man	M: 27	W: 29	/	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Worker W: Psychologist
7	Italy-Nigeria	5	Man	M: 36	W: 28	/	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Worker W: Educator
8	Italy-India	10	Man	M: 34	W: 35	1	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Worker W: Employee
9	Italy-Perù	8	Woman	M: 44	W: 38	1	M: University degree W: University degree	M: Manager W: Housewife
10	Italy-Burkina Faso	5	Man	M: 38	W: 33	1	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Worker W: Educator
11	Italy-Burkina Faso	5	Man	M: 35	W: 43	1	M: Secondary School W: University degree	M: Unemployed W: Teacher

Legend: H = husband; W = wife; W*= woman; M = man.