Cross-Cultural Patterns of Interracial Marriage

By

Tim B. Heaton
And
Cardell K. Jacobson

Department of Sociology
Brigham Young University

September 2004

Cross-Cultural Patterns of Interracial Marriage

Abstract

This paper compares patterns of interracial marriage in seven different cultural contexts. Four aspects of intermarriage are considered. First, log-linear models are as estimated to gage the extent of overall homogamy and race specific homogamy in each setting. Second, residuals from these models are used to assess gender differences in intermarriage. Multinomial logistic regression is then used to evaluate age and educational differences. Age is included as a surrogate for trends over time, and education is included as a measure of social status. We hypothesize that intermarriage will increase over time-but not necessarily at the same rate for each racial group or racial category. We also hypothesize that higher education is associated with higher rates of outmarriage from low-status groups, but lower rates of outmarriage from high-status groups. In other words, the average difference in status between two groups will be associated with the degree of influence education has on intermarriage.

Census data were obtained for each of the cultural contexts. We begin with the United States because a substantial body of research focuses on the United States. Canada shares some culture, history, and language with the United States, but does not have a legacy of slavery and has different patterns of immigration. New Zealand, like the U.S. and Canada, has as history of British and European settlement, but the indigenous population of New Zealand is a much larger share of the total population. In contrast to these three immigrant societies, South Africa experienced colonization, but the indigenous population remained the numerical majority. South Africa also had a period when contact between groups was legally and socially restricted. The next two data sets are from provinces in China. Beijing is selected because it is the political and educational center of the society. We also include a province where a minority group is the numerical majority. Finally, we include Hawaii because of its reputation as a melting pot for a wide variety of different groups.

Ideological, social, and political forces have been working to reduce racial discrimination and to create more equal relationships among racial and ethnic groups. Marriage is often viewed as the last barrier to racial integration, making intermarriage a critical indicator of inter-group relationships. While numerous researchers have examined inter-group marriage between racial and ethnic groups in the United States, fewer have examined factors associated with inter-group marriage in an international perspective. Using recent census data, we examine the factors predicting inter-group marriage in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and parts of the Peoples Republic of China. We also include Hawaii as a special case since that state has a long history of racial tolerance and intermarriage. The six societies are geographically diverse, have different racial and ethnic histories, and compositions.

Increased international migration in recent decades has increased the racial and ethnic diversity in a number of countries, resulting in greater social proximity between individuals from different groups and contact in the workplace and other social institutions. This international migration is, at least in part, a major factor leading to interracial unions (Sung, 1990; Tzeng, 2000). At the same time, cultural norms against inter-group marriage have decreased resulting in less pressure to marry homogamously. The United States, Canada, and New Zealand are all immigrant societies in which Euro-Americans or whites are the dominant group.

South Africa provides a contrast to these immigrant societies because while it was a colonized country, the indigenous peoples remained a numerical majority. The whites, of course, had the political, social, and economic power.

China provides an additional contrast. While many people consider current-day China to be ethnically homogamous, China actually is composed of 56 groups, 55 of which China recognizes officially as minority groups. Altogether, the minority groups comprise four percent of the population. The groups are not evenly distributed across China, however. We examine two areas in China, Beijing, its capital city and Xinjiang Province in Northwest China. Xinjiang Province is composed of Uyghers (percent), Han (percent), as well as several other smaller groups. Though the Han are the dominant group in China, they number less than half the population in Xinjiang Province and are mostly immigrants or the children of immigrants in the province.

In this paper we examine three factors that have been shown to be related to inter-group in previous research and compare the factors across the six contexts. More specifically; gender, age and education have been used as indicators of cultural and social indicators of racial and ethnic status.

Gender Imbalances in Interracial Marriage

Gender imbalances in interracial marriages are common in the United States and Canada (Qian, 1997; Jacobson and Heaton, 2000), and Canada (Ram, 1990; Tzeng, 2000). In both countries white male-Asian female marriages are much more common than the reverse. Black-white marriages in the United States, however, show an inverse pattern with Black male-white female marriage numbering roughly twice the number of white male-black female marriages. The Asian female-white male marriages in Canada also tend to occur when the wife has high educational levels or works more often than her husband (Tzeng, 2000).

Studies conducted in the United States also show that interethnic marriage is more common for foreign females than it is for foreign males (Lee and Yamanaka, 1990). This is especially true for those from male-dominated cultures such as Japan (Tinker, 1982).

Some of the gender differences in interracial may reflect decreasing traditional norms. In most Asian cultures the family name is continued through the sons, not daughters, and historically sons have been valued more than daughters. While this gives Asian sons more latitude in choosing a mate, the daughters may also look outside their traditional community to seek a mate (Koo 1985; Watson, Jashcok and Miers, 1994; Cheung, 1997; Hays, 2001).

A similar phenomenon may be occurring in Black-White marriages. As traditional norms about marriage decline white women may seek partners outside of their own group.

Generation or Age

The literature on inter-group marriage suggests that younger generations are consistently more likely than older generations both to approve of inter-group marriage (Schuman et al., 1997) and to marry exogamously. Research in the United States has consistently shown age to be inversely associated with inter-group marriage (Gurak and Fitzpatrick, 1982; Tinker, 1982; Wong, 1989; Sung, 1990; Lee and Yamanaka, 1990; Qian, 1997; Jacobson and Heaton, 2000). Lee and Yamanaka's (1990) study, for example, found that native-born Asian Americans were three times more likely to intermarry than foreign-born women. Researchers have suggested that younger generations have shed discriminatory beliefs and practices, resulting in a more open attitude towards other races (Gurak and Fitzpatrick, 1982). Some researchers also believe that younger generations are better able to adapt to a new culture and society (Tinker, 1982; Gurak and Fitzpatrick, 1982). Further, Younger generations, or second or subsequent generations, generally are more assimilated and thus less likely to have strong ties to their native land and cultures (Lee and Yamanaka 1990; Sung, 1990; Wong, 1989).

Generational status and intermarriage are also important in Canada where younger generations are significantly more likely than younger generations to marry exogamously (Ram, 1990; Tzeng, 2000). For white ethnic groups the reverse is true (Kalbach, 2000). For white ethnic groups, couples often are married before their arrival in Canada (Kalbach, 2003). A second explanation for the lower rates of outmarriage among the younger generations is that they often do not speak either of the official Canadian languages. Tzeng (2000), for example, estimates that 98 percent of those who are outmarried are capable of speaking one or both of the official languages.

Cultural factors, no doubt, also affect the rates of intermarriage. Older members of society are more simply more set in their ways, adhere to older social norms, and thus are less to intermarry. Furthermore the norms and acceptance of Intergroup marriage have changed dramatically over the past 40 or so years (see Schuman et al., 1997).

Education

A number of researchers have found that individuals from higher socio-economic status groups are more likely than others to exhibit both higher acceptance of others and are more likely to marry exogamously (e.g. Sandefur and McKinnel, 1986; Tinker, 1982; Schoen, Wooldredge, and Thomas, 1989). While inter-group contact within educational institutions often remains less than ideal for the improvement of racial attitudes (Schaefer, 1996), educational institutions provide opportunities for increased inter-group

contact and acceptance that may not exist in other parts of society. The increased approval may result from at least two aspects of education. First, attendance at college may facilitate normative acceptance of others. Indeed, the research indicates that those who attend college are the most likely of all educational levels to approve of inter-group marriage (see Glick, 1970; Tinker, 1973; Fitzpatrick and Gurak, 1979, Kitano, 1984; Mayer, 1985; Sung, 1990; Qian and Preston, 1993; Tzeng, 2000; Fu and Heaton 199??; Tzeng, 2000).

Other researchers have found that education is positively associated with actual rates of intermarriage (Sandefur and McKinnel, 1986; Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan, 1990: Kalmijn, 1993; Qian, 1997; Heaton and Jacobson, 2000; Jacobs and Labov, 2002; Jacobson and Heaton, 2003; Jacobson, Yaw, and Heaton, 2004). Some research, however, has not shown this positive association (Hwang, Saenz, and Aguirre 1995), and some shows no association at all (Kitano et al., 1984).

The use of education in the analysis presents some potential problems, and the actual effects of education may be underestimated. For example, the mere co-presence of other groups does not necessarily lead to contact, the co-presence of large numbers of members of other groups may actually present a racial threat to some whites (see Bobo, 1983; Bobo and Kluegel, 1993; Quillian, 1996; Taylor; 1998).

Additionally, how education is measured varies across nations. And some who have attended college may have received their education years or decades earlier. The effects of education may thus be underestimated, and the relationship between education and inter-group marriage may not be as strong for older generations as it is for younger generations.

Some research has also found that educational homogamy is related to the level of economic development. Smits, Ultee, and Lammers (1998) used educational homogamy rates as a measure of openness. They found that as the level of development increases, educational homogamy increases. For the highest levels of economic development, however, educational homogamy decreases again. While the United States, Canada, and New Zealand are economically developed countries, most parts of China are not, and parts of South Africa are not. These differences may account for some of the differences we find across the six countries.

Studies generally show educational homogamy, that people tend to marry within their own level of education (Qian, 1999). Studies conducted with Chinese Americans also show that Chinese Americans who intermarry have more education, regardless of gender (Sung, 1990; Wong, 1989). But, education sometimes interacts with gender or generation. For example, Tzeng (2000) found that the effect of the wife's educational attainment has twice the effect that men's education did in predicting interracial marriage. And females in the United States are more likely to marry someone with a higher degree of education (Qian, 1999). At the same time, minority males are more likely to marry a female with a lower educational status in exchange for her higher ethnic status (Kalmijn, 1993; Lee and Yamanaka, 1990).

Data sources

Data for the analysis are taken from national census. Although census data are limited by lack of information about conditions when the marriage occurred, they are the most comparable source of data for cross-cultural analysis. Public use samples we

available for the US in 2000, South Africa in 2001, and China in 1990. Special tabulations were obtained for Canada in 1996 and New Zealand in 1996.

In each census, we selected currently married partners of the opposite sex matched on household id numbers. A few households with multiple married couples were eliminated to insure correct matching of partners.

Loglinear models are used to examine patterns of intermarriage and sex differences. Multinomial logistic regression is employed to identify patterns by age and education.

Results

Table 1 shows the racial/ethnic distribution for groups used here. Some smaller groups did not include sufficient cases for detailed analysis. Heterogeneous groups are also lumped together. Still these numbers do allow us to compare general trends, with roughly similar numbers of groups in each context.

Many contexts have a single large majority group. In the U.S., Canada, and New Zealand Whites constitute at least 80 percent of the total population. Han are also a vast majority in Beijing. Blacks are less of a majority in South Africa, but still constitute two-thirds of the population. Hawaii is more divided with Asians totaling slightly over half of the population. Finally, Xinjiang Province has to groups that are roughly equal in size, along with two other smaller groups.

In most cases, the distribution of husbands and wives is nearly equal. Hawaii is the only exception. Selective patterns of marriage and migration could each account for the differences in Hawaii.

Results of model fitting are shown in Table 2. As expected, the model of simple independence does not fit in any of the settings. Homogamy is common in each of these contexts. In each case, adding one parameter for the universal tendency toward homogamy accounts for the large majority of the association between husband's and wife's race/ethnicity. In most cases, the homogamy effect explains over 90 percent of the association. The exceptions are Beijing and New Zealand, when homogamy still accounts for over 80 percent of the association.

The third model allows each race/ethnic groups to have its unique endogamy parameter. In each country we see an additional improvement in model fit, indicating that the degree of homogamy varies across groups.

Parameters for universal homogamy from model 2 and group specific homogamy from model 3 are shown in Table 3. In-marriage is comparative low in Hawaii, New Zealand and Beijing. In these context, and for the groups included here, groups are about ten time more likely to marry endogamously that would be expected by chance. The U.S. and Canada have values over three times greater than in these three contexts. Still, these values are small compared to South Africa and Xinjiang Province where parameters exceed 200. Clearly, there is substantial variation in tendencies toward in-marriage.

Individual group parameters show even greater variation. Where Whites are a majority, they tend to have low rates of in-marriage. Likewise, Hans in Beijing have very low rates of endogamy compared with all other groups considered here. Presumably, when minority groups marry someone from a different group, they tend to marry into the majority. This could be because of contact and tendencies to assimilate into the dominant society. In contrast, Whites in South have the second to highest parameter of any group considered. South African Whites are over 2000 time more likely to marry endogamously

that would be expected on the basis of change. The only other group in this range is the Uighur of Xinjiang Province.

Blacks are the most isolated group in the United States and Hawaii. However, in Canada where there is not a legacy of slavery, Blacks are less isolated in the marriage market than Arabs or Hispanics. Indigenous populations In the U.S., Canada, Hawaii, and New Zealand have relatively low rates of endogamy. Asians generally have higher endogamy rates than Native Americans. Asian in-marriage is quite high in New Zeland and especially high in South Africa.

Hispanic rates of inmarriage vary by context. The ratio for Hispanics is five times higher in the U.S. than in Hawaii, but 12 time higher in Canada than in the U.S.

Not surprisingly, given its history of race relations, South Africa has high rates of in-marriage for most groups. Only the Coloureds, who have a long history of intermarriage, have moderate rates of inmarriage.

Gender

The final model fits an additional parameter for each combination of race/ethnicity on the off-diagonal. The remaining association occurs because males and females have different patterns of intermarriage. In the two Chinese samples and in South Africa, this remaining association is small and statistically nonsignificant. Each other country shows some gender difference. In the U.S. there is a larger than expected number of marriages between White men and Asian women, and between Black men and White women. Also, Asian men are more likely to marry Hispanic women, but Hispanic men do not marry Asian women.

In Hawaii, there is also a tendency for White men to marry Asian women. But Asian men are inclined toward Pacific Island or Hispanic wives. There is also a tendency for White women to marry Hispanic and Pacificic Island husbands.

The tendency for White men to marry Asian women is also evident in Canada. There are also more marriages bewteen White men and Black or Hispanic women than would be expected. In contrast, Asian men appear to prefer Native Canadians and Hispanic wives. White women show a tendency to marry Native and Arabic men.

In New Zealand, European men apparently prefer to marry women from Asia or other pacific Islands rather than Maoris. Maori men are more likely to marry European women. There are also higher than expected marriages between men from other Pacific Islands and Maori women, and between Asian men and women from the Pacific Islands including Maoris.

Age

Age is included as a surrogate for trends. Age is not a perfect indicator because intermarriage could be associated with older age at marriage, higher rates of marital dissolution, and differential mortality. But given the lack of longitudinal data for many societies, age is about the best we can do.

Table 4 shows coefficients for age. In the U.S., most effects are negative, implying an increase in intermarriage. The greatest changes are for marriages between Blacks and Whites, and Blacks and Hispanics. Native Americans have a longer history of inter-marriage such that coefficients tend to be less negative for them.

In Hawaii, age coefficients are mixed. Marriages between white men and Pacific Island or Asian women apparently have been occurring for a long enough period such

that no age pattern is evident. There is more evidence that marriage with Hispanics is becoming more common, but this is not universal. Still the overall tendency is for coefficients to be negative, suggesting that the tradition of intermarriage in Hawaii has accelerated somewhat.

Most of the age coefficients in Canada are negative and statistically significant, implying increases in intermarriage. But there are some interesting exceptions to the pattern. Some coefficients for marriages between whites and natives are positive.

The New Zealand data does not include husband's age. People providing the data did not want to give too much detail because of confidentiality of data. Thus, we used wife's age in each set of equations. The coefficients are generally negative, implying increases in inter-group marriage. The exceptions are for marriages between European men and Maori or Pacific Island women, and between European women and Maori men. Perhaps these marriages have been occurring for a long enough period that recent increases are not evident.

In South Africa, most age coefficients are negative, the most interesting exception being marriages between Whites and Blacks. Patterns suggest that race barriers between Blacks, Coloureds and Asians are eroding. Likewise, barriers between Coloureds, Asians and Whites are also eroding. But the gap between Whites and Blacks is apparently as wide as ever.

All of the coefficients for Beijing are negative supporting the hypothesis that intermarriage is on the rise. There were not enough intermarriages in Xinjiang to justify more detailed.

Education

Education coefficients are reported in Table 5. In the U.S., twenty-five of the thirty-four coefficients are positive, indicating that education facilitates out-marriage across many groups. The coefficients are particularly large for intermarriages involving marriages to Asians. But a few coefficients are negative. White men who marry Native Americans are less educated than White men who marry endogamously. White women who marry Native Americans or Hispanics have lower educational attainment. Asian women who marry black men also have comparatively low educational attainment. Educational attainment is higher for whites and Asians than for Blacks, Native Americans and Hispanics. Averaging coefficients across groups shows that people who marry from higher education groups into lower education groups tend to have lower status, and those from less educated groups who marry into more educated groups have higher status. Thus, there is support for both hypotheses that more education facilitates intermarriage, and that this is especially true for people from groups with lower overall education. There is not a clear tendency for status exchange to be gender specific. For example, coefficients for Black, Native American or Hispanic men who marry White women are comparable to coefficients for Black, Native American or Hispanic women who marry White men.

Since patterns are complex, and additional step was taken to summarize education effects. An aggregate data file was created with an observation for each possible pair of race combinations. The dependent variable is the education coefficient from the multinomial regression reported in Table 5. Average education for the race group in each pair was included as well as the gender of the person whose age and education were

included in the multinomial regression are also included. In essence, this is a multi-level analysis. Because of the small number of pairs in some countries, the large sample sizes, and the complexity of multinomial regression, multi-level statistical programs were not used in the analysis.

Regression models are reported in Table 6. The dependent variable is the education coefficient. Independent variables include the difference in education for the two groups being compared, gender, and a gender-education gap interaction. Coefficents from these regressions are used to test three hypotheses. First, the constant term test the hypothesis that education facilitates intermarriage. Positive values are consistent with this hypothesis. Second, the education gap variable tests the hypothesis that the importance of education depends on the difference in the average education levels for the groups being compared. Finally, the interaction term tests the exchange hypothesis that education matters more for men than for women.

In the United States, only the first hypothesis is supported. On average, coefficients are positive implying that higher education is associated with higher probabilities of out-marriage. The education gap variable and the interaction are not statistically significant and the explained variance is small. In the U.S., it appears that the importance of education is not contingent on the average education of ethnic groups.

In Hawaii, Whites who marry out tend to have lower education that those who marry endogamously. In contrast, other groups who marry whites have above average educational status. With some exceptions that are not statistically significant, coefficients for intermarriage between Pacific Islanders, Asians and Hispanics are positive. Thus, higher education appears to facilitate out-marriage, except for whites. Higher order analysis reported in Table 6 indicates that, on average, education is not a strong predictor of out-marriage. However, the education difference between groups is a good predictor of the importance of education, explaining over 60 percent of the variation in the magnitude of education coefficients. The gender interaction indicates that higher education is less important in facilitating female out-marriage into higher status groups or deterring female out-marriage to lower status groups.

In New Zealand, White and Asian men who marry Maori women have lower education, as is the case for White or Asian women who marry Maori or Pacific Island men. People who marry exagamously and have White or Asian partners tend to have higher education, especially if they come from the lower status Maori or Pacific Island groups. Thus, New Zealand is consistent with the hypothesis that people who marry into higher status groups have more education, but the reverse is true for people who marry into lower status groups. Regression results for New Zealand support each of the three hypotheses regarding education. The overall effect of education is to facilitate out-marriage. This is especially the case for out-marriage to higher status groups. Indeed, education deters out-marriage to lower status groups. Finally, the magnitude of educational exchange is more salient for males than females.

Patterns of educational exchange are also quite consistent. Higher education is associated with greater chances for marriage into higher status groups and lower education is associated with greater chances for marriage into lower status groups. The average education effect is slightly positive and the gender interaction is small. So that the educational exchange described above is the dominant patters in the data.

Education coefficients for Beijing indicate that Hui and Manchu men who marry Han women have above average education. Likewise, Han men who marry Hui women have above average education. Coefficients for marriage of Han men and Manchu women are negative. There are not enough pairs to run a regression predicting magnitude of education coefficients, but the correlation between the education gap between pairs of ethnic groups and the magnitude of the education coefficient is a very small -.057. Thus Beijing data do not support the education exchange hypothesis.

There were not enough intermarriages in Xinjiang to justify further analysis.

Conclusions

Racial and ethnic homogamy are evident in each of the societies we consider here. But rates of in-group marriage vary dramatically across societies, and across groups within societies.

There is a common pattern of marriage between white men and Asian women. Other patterns (black men and white men) are country specific.

Age differences suggest a general pattern of increase in intermarriage, but not for some groups with a longer history of intermarriage, or for groups with persisting gaps such as whites and blacks in South Africa.

There is strong support for the three education hypothesis in some countries (Canada and New Zealand), partial support in others (USA, South Africa and Hawaii).

References

Cheung, Fanny M. 1997. "Engendering Hong Kong Society: A Gender Perspective of Women's Status." Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

Gladney, Dru C. 1996. "Muslim Chinese: Ethnic Nationalism in the People's Republic." 2nd Ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University: Harvard University Press.

Heaton, Tim B., and Cardell K. Jacobson. 2000. "Intergroup Marriage: An Examination of Opportunity Structures." *Sociological Inquiry* 70:30-41.

Hwang, Sean-Shong, Rogelio Saenz, and Aguirre E. Benigno. "The SES Selectivity of Interethnicly Married Asians." International Migration Review 29: 469-491. 1995.

Kitano, Harry H. L., Wai-Tsang Yeung, Lynn Chai, and Herbert Tatanaka. 1984. "Asian American Interethnic Marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family. 46: 170-190.

Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1993. "Trends in Black/White Intermarriage." *Social Forces,* 72:119-146.

Kitano, Harry H.L. and L.K. Chai. 1982. "Korean Interracial Marriage." *Marriage and Family Review* 5:75-89.

Lee, Sharon M. and Keiko Yamanaka. "Patterns of Asian American Intermarriage and Marital Assimilation." Journal of Comparative Family Studies 1990 Sum; Volume 21 (2): 287-305. Canada: University of Calgary.

Mackerras, Colin.1995. "China's Minority Cultures: Identities and Integration Since 1912." New York: St. Martin's Press.

Mamet, Rizvan. 2002. "Ethnic Intermarriage in Beijing and Xinjiang China, 1990." Master of Science, Thesis Brigham Young University.

Qian, Zhenchao, and Samuel H. Preston, 1993. "Changes in American Marrriage, 1972 to 1987: Availability and Forces of Attraction by Age and Education." *American Sociological Review*, 58: 482-495.

Qian, Zhenchao. "Who Intermarries? Education, Nativity, Region, and Interethnic Marriage, 1980 and 1990." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 1999 Fal;Volume 30(4): 579-597. Canady: University of Calgary.

Qian, 1997

Sung, Betty L. 1990. "Chinese American Intermarriage." Journal of Comparative Family Studies 21: 337-352.

Tzeng, Jessie, M. 2000? "Ethnically Heterogamous Marriages: The Case of Asian Canadians." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, Vol?;321-337.

Wong, Morrison G. "A Look at Intermarriage among the Chinese in the United States in 1980." *Sociological Perspectives* 32: 87-107. 1989.

Table 1 - Race/Ethic Composition of Cultural Settings (percent)

	USA	
	Husband	Wife
White	80.2	79.7
Black	6.2	5.9
Asian	3.1	3.6
Native American	0.6	0.6
Hispanic	9.9	10.2
(n)	(559,983)	

	Hawaii	
	Husband	Wife
White	32.8	28.6
Black	2.4	1.5
Asian	51.6	56.9
Native American	8.3	7.8
Hispanic	4.9	5.2
(n)	(8,839)	

	Canada	
	Husband	Wife
White	87.1	86.9
Asian	8.7	9
Black	1.5	1.4
Hispanic	0.6	0.7
Native	1.0	1.1
Arah	1.1	0.9
(n)	(10,192,270)	

	New Zeland	
	Husband	Wife
European	82.7	82
Mauri	9.6	9.7
Other Pacific Islander	3.7	3.6
Ascan	4.1	1.7
(n)	(46,344,704)	

	South Africa	
	Husband	Wife
Black	67.9	67.7
Colured	11.3	11.6
Asian	4.2	4.2
Whole	16.6	16.5
(n)	(305,758)	

	Beijing	
	Husband	Wife
Black	95.5	96.4
Colured	2.3	2.3
Asian	2.2	1.3
(n)	(22,119)	

	Xinjiang	
	Husband	Wife
Uighur	46.9	47
Han	44.9	44.8
Hui	4.8	4.7
Kazakh	3.5	3.4
(n)	(27,048)	

Table 2 - Log Linear Models for Cross-tabulations of Husbands and Wives

Race/Ethnicity

Model	USA			Hawaii		
	χ^2	d.f.	% of 1	χ^2	d.f.	% of 1
1. Independence	571077.7	16	---	7960.9	16	---
2. Universal homogany	12684.2	15	2.22	373.7	15	
3.Group Specific homogany	827.3	11	0.14	23	11	0.29
4. Gander Symetry	128.6	6	0.02	19.3	6	0.24

	New Zealand			South Africa		
	χ^2	d.f.	% of 1	χ^2	d.f.	% of 1
1. Independence	12005398.3	9	---	726554.2	9	---
2. Universal homogany	1658883	8	13.8	3062.6	8	0.42
3.Group Specific homogany	114800	5	0.96	361.8	5	0.05
4. Gander Symetry	29622.2	3	0.25	3.2	3	<.01

	Canada			Beijing		
	χ^2	d.f.	% of 1	χ^2	d.f.	% of 1
1. Independence	7,255,190.3	25	---	3417.1		---
2. Universal homogany	219618	24	3.02	673	4	19.7
3.Group Specific homogany	12122	19	0.17	0.4	3	0.01
4. Gander Symetry	396.3		0.05			

	Xinjiang		
	χ^2	d.f.	% of 1
1. Independence	50437.04	9	---
2. Universal homogany	301.5	8	0.59
3.Group Specific homogany	128.09	5	0.25
4. Gander Symetry	5.46	3	0.01

Table 3 - Odds Ratios for Homogamous Marriage

	Overall Homogamy		Group Specific Homogeny
USA	35.88	White	10.07
		Black	692.29
		Native American	33.78
		Asian	164.02
		Hispanic	39.65
Hawaii	9.68	White	3.86
		Black	232.76
		Asian	14.01
		Pacific Island	20.29
		Hispanic	8.33
Canada			
	37.11	White	5.64
		Asian	287.15
		Black	217.02
		Hispanic	473.43
		Native American	16.95
		Arab	796.32
New Zealand	9.631	European	6.11
		Maori	3.53
		Other Pacific Islander	53.52
		Asian	210.61
South Africa	237.70	African	376.15
		Colored	25.28
		Asian	685.4
		White	2,164.62
Beijing	11.38	Han	1.48
		Hui	869.40
		Manchu	6.65
Xinjang	287.15	Uighur	2,344.90
		Han	330.30
		Hui	23.1

Kazakh	473.43

Table 4 - Effects of Age on Intermarriage

USA

		Wife				
Husbands:	Age of	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Hispanic
White	H	---	.044*	-.024*	-.018*	.034
	W	---	-.041*	.003	-.001	.008*
Black	H	-.032*	---	-.025*	-.013	-.040*
	W	-.053	---	-.020	-.020	-.010*
Native American	H	.002	.031*	---	---	-.015*
	W	-.029*	.012	---	---	.000
Asian	H	-.018*	---	---	---	-.028*
	W	-.033	---	---	---	-.002
Hispanic	H	-.005*	-.011*	-.004	-.012*	---
	W	-.045*	-.039	-.023*	-.039*	---

Hawaii

		Wife			
Husband:	Age of	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic
White	H	---	.005	-.007	-.026*
	W	---	-.032*	-.031*	.014
Pacific Islander	H	-.022*	---	-.022*	-.043*
	W	-.004	---	-.016	-.011*

Asian	H	.022*	.021*	---	---
	W	-.002*	.022*	---	---
Hispanic	H	-.005	.013	---	---
	W	-.040*	-.062	---	---

Canada

		Wife					
Husband:	Age of	White	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Arab
White	H	---	.321*	-.378*	-.538*	-.488*	-.409*
	W	---	-.310*	-.196*	-.252*	.153*	-.040*
Asian	H	-.425*	---	-.248*	-.414*	-.773*	.137*
	W	-.294*	---	-.026	-.114*	-.013	-.251
Black	H	-.373	.267*	---	-.699*	-.499*	-.650*
	W	-.425*	.388	---	-.301*	.012	-.415*
Hispanic	H	-.457*	-.459*	-.499*	---	-.906*	-1.015
	W	-.623*	-.553*	-.834*	---	-.368*	-.268*
Native Americans	H	-.040*	-.119*	-.066	-.967*	---	-.045*
	W	-.540*	-.788*	-.617*	-.860	---	-.663
Arab	H	.336*	-.507*	-.769*	-.999	-1.306*	---
	W	-.399*	-.367*	-.580*	-.438*	-.535	---

New Zealand

	Wife			
Husband:	European	Mauri	Other Pacific Island	Asian

European	---	-.348*	-.348*	-.408*
	---	-.122*	.122*	-.049*
Mauri	-.015*	---	---	-.190*
	-.445*	---	---	-.402*
Other Pacific Islander	-.129*	-.428*	-.428*	-.473*
	-.520*	-328*	-.328*	-.687*
Asian	-.074*	-.411*	-.411*	---
	-.379	-.189*	-.189*	---

South Africa

	Wife			
Husbands:	Black	Coloured	Asian	White
Black	---	-.035*	-.043*	.029
	---	-.050*	-.051*	-.027
Coloured	-.022*	---	-.021*	-.021*
	-.018*	---	-.043	-.062*
Asian	-.060*	-.022*	---	-.069*
	-.135*	-.013*	---	-.099*
White	-.003*	-.024*	.039*	---
	-.002*	-.017*	-.033	---

Beijing

	Wife		
Husbands:	Han	Hui	Manchu
Han	---	-.023*	-.032*

	---	-.040*	-.025*
Hui	-.037*	---	---
	-.015	---	---
Manchu	-.008	---	---
	-.023	---	---

Table 5
Effects of Education on Intermarriage

USA

		Wife				
	Education of	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Hispanic
White	H	—	.078*	-.080*	.199*	.048*
	W	—	.152*	.164*	.038*	.277*
Black	H	.112*	—	.096	.184*	.068*
	W	-.017	—	.219*	-.066*	.216*
Native American	H	.163*	.170*	—	—	.118*
	W	-.083*	-.040	—	—	.142*
Asian	H	.124*	—	—	—	.002
	W	.254*	—	—	—	.229
Hispanic	H	.224*	.154*	.044*	.286*	—
	W	.026*	-.017	-.040	-.016	—

Hawaii

	Wife			
	White	Pacific Islander	Asian	Hispanic
White	—	—	-.177*	-.222*
	—	.069*	-.147*	.272*
Pacific Islander	.159*	—	-.028	-.007
	-.034	—	.100	.171*
Asian	.178*	.102*	—	—
	-.026	.044	—	—

Hispanic	.169*	.126*	—	—
	-.134*	-.024	—	—

Table 5 Continued

Canada

	Wife					
	White	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian
White	—	.333*	.142*	.211*	-.231*	.426*
	—	.361*	.192*	.418*	.250*	.346*
Asian	.282*	—	.119*	.184*	-.081*	.382*
	.347*	—	.180*	.464*	.416*	.116*
Black	.120*	.175*	—	.147*	-.305*	.261*
	.164*	.211*	—	.217*	.336*	-.066
Hispanic	.296*	.234*	-.092	—	-.266*	.534*
	.271*	.280*	.067	—	.516*	.386*
Native American	.196*	.387*	.395*	.028	—	.822*
	-.121*	.053*	.093*	-.058	—	.406*
Arab	.180*	.186*	-.165*	.023	.138*	—
	.399*	.393*	-.091*	.516*	.696*	—

New Zealand

			Wife	
European	—	-.280	-.127	.152*
	—	.319*	.445*	.239*
Mauri	.427*	—	.155*	.588*
	-.256*	—	.178*	.049*
Other Pacific Islander	.526*	.062*	—	.988*
	-.147*	.058*	—	-.022
Asian	.146*	-.365*	-.341*	—
	.297*	.255*	.288*	—

Table 5 Continued

		South Africa		
		Wife		
Black	—	-.027*	.123*	.214
	—	-.143*	-.040*	-.112*
Colored	-.147*	—	-.142*	.276*
	-.050*	—	-.053*	-.078*
Asian	-.161*	.007	—	.206*
	.062	.162*	—	-.040
White	-.078*	-.071*	.023*	—
	0.196	.208*	.132	—
		Beijing		
		Wife		

Han	—	.348*	-.154
	—	.137	-.272
Hui	.333*	—	—
	.596*	—	—
Manchu	.148*	—	—
	.497*	—	—

Table 6
Regression of Education Coefficients on Gender Average Education of Groups

	Constant	Education diff.	Gender	Gender Interaction	R2
1. USA	.117*	-.009	-.040	-.017	.139
2. Hawaii	.029	-.086	.030	.020	.692
3. Canada	.178*	-.370*	.081	.145	.419
4. New Zealand	.161*	-.791*	-.027	.449*	.821
5. South Africa	.042	-.029*	-.022	.004	.706