Divergent Pathways to Assimilation? Local Marriage Markets and Intermarriage among U.S. Hispanics

Zhenchao Qian,
Department of Sociology, Brown University, zhenchao_qian@cornell.edu

Daniel T. Lichter, and
Departments of Policy Analysis and Management and Sociology, Cornell University, dtl28@cornell.edu

Dmitry Tumin
The Ohio State University, tumin.1@osu.edu

Abstract

The growing diversity of the U.S. population raises questions about integration among America's fastest growing minority population—Hispanics. The canonical view is that intermarriage with the native-born white population represents a singular pathway to assimilation, one that varies over geographic space in response to uneven local marital opportunities. Using data on past-year marriage from the 2009–2014 *American Community Survey*, we demonstrate high rates of intermarriage among Hispanics. Our analyses identify whether Hispanics marry co-ethnics, non-co-ethnic Hispanics, non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, or other minorities. We highlight variation by race, nativity, and socioeconomic status, but also reveal that Hispanics living in new immigrant destinations are more likely to intermarry than those living in traditional Hispanic gateways. Indeed, the higher out-marriage in new destinations disappears when the demographic context of reception is taken into account. Our analysis underscores that patterns of marital assimilation among Hispanics are neither monolithic nor expressed uniformly across geographic space.

Keywords

Hispanics; assimilation; integration; immigration; mate selection

Introduction

The number and rate of interracial marriages have increased rapidly in the United States since the 1970s (Wang, 2012). Much of this growth reflects high rates of intermarriage among America's fastest-growing immigrant populations, including Hispanics. Yet, over the past decade, rates of intermarriage between Hispanics and whites have stalled or reversed (Qian & Lichter, 2007). Declines in intermarriage rates are due at least in part to growing numbers of Hispanics and other ethnoracial minorities —both native-born and foreign-born

— in the United States. Growing ethnoracial diversity has provided opportunities for ethnoracial minorities to marry within their own pan-ethnic group or with other minorities rather than only "marrying out" to whites (Qian, Glick, & Batson, 2012). Newly emerging patterns of intermarriage challenge the single path put forward by classical assimilation theory and instead suggest highly segmented trajectories of integration among America's ethnoracial minorities, including Hispanics (Alba & Nee, 2003).

Assimilation also occurs "in place" (Waters & Pinceau, 2016). Intermarriage rates presumably respond unevenly to local-area marriage market conditions, such as the numerical availability of Hispanics, whites, and other ethnoracial minorities (Campbell & Martin, 2016; Choi & Tienda, 2017). In recent decades, Hispanics have become more geographically dispersed across the United States, relocating from traditional immigrant gateway cities to new metropolitan areas in which shares of Hispanic co-ethnics often are numerically or proportionately small. The diffusion of Hispanics into new destinations provides evidence of spatial assimilation (Waters & Pinceau, 2016). The geographic spread of Hispanics also presents new opportunities for marital assimilation, which may be expressed in diverse forms. To be sure, the growing exposure of Hispanics to potential partners with different ethnoracial backgrounds provides a necessary yet insufficient condition for intergroup social interaction, friendship, intimacy, and marriage. It remains unclear, however, whether the burgeoning Hispanic population now living in so-called "new destinations" increasingly intermarry with people of different ethnoracial backgrounds as compared to Hispanics living in traditional gateways, where opportunities to marry co-ethnics who share common cultures are presumably greatest.

In this paper, we document highly segmented patterns of Hispanic intermarriage in traditional gateways and new destinations using data on past-year marriages from the 2009–2014 rounds of the *American Community Survey*. Our study has two main objectives. First, we highlight national patterns of heterogeneity in Hispanic intermarriage and demonstrate that marital assimilation takes multiple paths. We update trends in Hispanic intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites (Lichter, Brown, Qian, & Carmalt, 2007) but also extend previous studies by considering intermarriage with other Hispanic co-ethnics (native or immigrant generations) and other racial minorities, including non-Hispanic blacks. Second, we explore whether patterns of Hispanic intermarriage adhere to canonical theories of spatial assimilation, which argue that the geographic spread of Hispanics to new destinations will enlarge demographic opportunities for intermarriage with whites or other ethnoracial minority populations. Here, we pay attention to local-area opportunities and constraints on intermarriage, taking into account metropolitan racial diversity, residential segregation, and income inequality.

Background

Diversity and Intermarriage

Classical assimilation theory is commonly used to explain the incorporation of ethnoracial and immigrant populations over time into American society (Gordon, 1964). Increasing rates of intermarriage, for example, suggest that immigrant minorities have adopted the cultural patterns of the majority population, such as its language and customs, and that minority

populations have become integrated, both economically and politically, into mainstream society (Waters & Pinceau, 2016). For example, European immigrants at the turn of the twentieth century were ethnically, culturally, and economically diverse. After a generation or two, group differences in education and labor market opportunities narrowed, and language and residential barriers were reduced or eliminated among different national origin groups (Lieberson, 1980; Pagnini & Morgan, 1990). Consequently, social and cultural boundaries across European ethnic groups weakened and interethnic marriages with white natives became commonplace as legal restrictions on immigration stemmed the flow of new immigrants from Europe.

For recent immigrant groups, including Hispanics who arrived during a period of substantial immigration, the prospect of intermarriage with majority native-born whites has become much less certain. The rapid growth of America's Hispanic population may have reinforced distinctive cultural traditions, increased group identity and solidarity, and fostered greater marital endogamy (Jiménez, 2008). A growing demographic supply of potential co-ethnic partners also means that many native-born Hispanics now marry immigrants of the same race and ethnicity rather than white partners (Lichter, Carmalt, & Qian, 2011). In this respect, the slowdown in intermarriage with whites may suggest a demographic pause in immigrant integration and incorporation. Classical assimilation theory is arguably ethnocentric, sometimes wrongly assuming a one-way pathway of incorporation into mainstream society. In reformulating assimilation theory, Alba and Nee (2003) recognize that the American mainstream is increasingly diverse, and that integration is often bi-directional and follows diverse pathways.

Indeed, increases in ethnoracial diversity may create the conditions for greater intergroup contact and intermarriage among Hispanic ethnic groups. Hispanic patterns of intermarriage may increasingly involve partners with different racial/ethnic backgrounds; indeed, intermarriage may have become more segmented and less closely tied to assimilation with the white majority. Today, non-Hispanic whites constitute about three-fifths of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau 2016), providing Hispanics—especially those with high levels of educational attainment—opportunities for formal and informal contact in schools, neighborhoods, and workplaces. Yet, new immigration and growing diversity also mean that Hispanics are increasingly exposed to not only their own co-ethnic (e.g., Mexicans to other Mexicans) or pan-ethnic peers (e.g., Mexicans to Salvadorans) but also to many other ethnic ancestry or ethnic origin groups (e.g., native-born blacks or both native- and foreign-born Asians). The substantive implication is that Hispanics are unlikely to follow a single or common path of assimilation involving intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites (Alba & Nee, 2003; Portes & Zhou, 1993).

Following reformulated assimilation theory, Qian, Glick, and Batson (2012) recently identified several alternatives to marital assimilation among America's immigrant populations. One option involves marriages between immigrants and their U.S.-born co-ethnics. Immigrants and their U.S.-born co-ethnic partners may be brought together by cultural similarities, such as language or religion, and shared access to economic resources and social networks. Intermarriage with native-born co-ethnics may therefore provide immigrants a route to upward social mobility in the U.S. (Furtado & Song, 2015). The

receptivity of U.S.-born Hispanics to such marriages may reflect the rigidity of ethnic boundaries that limit opportunities to marry whites or other groups. Previous studies suggest that intermarriage between foreign- and U.S.-born Hispanics has increased since the early 1990s (Lichter et al., 2011).

A second alternative to conventional intermarriage (i.e., between foreign- and native-born whites) involves marriages between partners from different ethnic or national origin groups but within the larger Hispanic pan-ethnic population. For example, two very different populations—Mexicans and Cubans—nevertheless are typically identified as Hispanic or Latino. Pan-ethnic identities have arguably grown stronger over time due to shared experiences in America, including exposure to prejudice and discrimination (Espiritu, 1992). U.S.-born Hispanics are often more aware of such identities than their foreign-born counterparts, who may maintain strong ethnic ties to their national origin group (Qian & Cobas, 2004). The implication is that cultural and social boundaries between different Hispanic national-origin groups may become increasingly blurred or permeable over time and across immigrant generations. Meanwhile, Hispanic immigrants of various national origin groups may be increasingly exposed to one another, especially those who share the same or similar neighborhoods. Speaking the same language (Spanish), practicing the same religion (Catholicism), and being perceived as "Hispanic" also may bring diverse national origin groups together in ways that promote new forms of intermarriage.

A third alternative to the canonical view of intermarriage is when Hispanic immigrants marry non-Hispanic racial minorities. Hispanic pan-ethnicity, as currently measured, includes people who self-identify as racially white, Amerindian, black, or as belonging to other or multiple races. White Hispanics, for example, are far more likely than non-white Hispanics to marry non-Hispanic whites; alternatively, non-white Hispanics may be more likely to marry non-white Hispanics of other national origins (Qian & Cobas, 2004). Similarities in religion, language, or residence may also promote Hispanic immigrants' greater exposure to non-Hispanic racial minorities. For example, Mexicans may marry Filipinos because of their shared religious traditions (e.g., Catholicism); and non-white Puerto Ricans may follow the color line and marry blacks more often than self-identified white Puerto Ricans, especially if the former are segregated from non-Hispanic whites in neighborhoods or occupational niches. For small racial minority and immigrant populations, opportunities to marry endogamously may be especially limited. It is well known that rates of marital endogamy are inversely associated with the relative size of the minority population (Blau, Beeker, & Fitzpatrick, 1984).

To summarize, marriages between Hispanics and other racial/ethnic groups suggest that barriers to social interaction and intimacy are changing in new ways. Evidence of intermarriage with native-born whites signals improved majority-minority relations and the incorporation of minorities into mainstream American society (Alba & Nee, 2003). Yet, intergenerational intermarriage with co-ethnic partners and marriages with pan-ethnic peers or non-Hispanic racial minorities may also suggest increasingly diverse trajectories of Hispanic incorporation. Of course, segmented trajectories of incorporation also depend on opportunities for interaction; that is, on exposure to diverse racial and ethnic groups in local marriage markets. This is an issue to which we now turn.

Spatial Integration, Local Marriage Markets, and Intermarriage

Growing ethnoracial diversity and the rise of majority-minority cities have played an important but often under-appreciated role in explaining intermarriage patterns among Hispanics (Frey, 2014). To be sure, individual traits, such as education, shape contemporary patterns of intermarriage (Rosenfeld, 2005), but the exposure of Hispanics—both natives and immigrants—to non-Hispanic whites, co-ethnics from different generations, Hispanics of other ethnic groups, and non-Hispanic racial minorities has been highly uneven across geographic areas. Local-area racial heterogeneity or diversity defines both opportunities and constraints on intermarriage of all kinds (Campbell & Martin, 2016; Harris & Ono, 2004).

The share of America's racial minorities in large cities increased rapidly during the 1990s and 2000s, due in large part to massive new immigration and widespread geographical dispersal of America's ethnoracial minorities (Frey, 2014; Waters & Pineau, 2016). The growth in America's minority populations as well as declining residential exposure and increasing economic inequality over the period between 1990 and 2000 contributed to the declines in rates of Hispanic intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites (Lichter et al., 2007). Today, growing shares of Hispanics who are immigrants may further reduce intermarriage rates with whites. Indeed, structural barriers limit Hispanics' contact opportunities with whites and circumscribe the marital-search process residentially and culturally. Each metropolitan area represents a local arena of social interaction among potential marital partners. Racial heterogeneity and the uneven exposure of Hispanics to other ethnoracial groups are important marriage market conditions that find demographic expression in observed patterns of intermarriage.

Two geographically-situated measures define the degree of racial heterogeneity: the number of racial groups in the population and the number of persons in each group (Blau, 1977). The number of racial and ethnic groups living in large metropolitan areas is often large and similar, but the group distributions are often dissimilar. For example, Logan and Zhang (2010) have described the emergence of multiracial, multiethnic "global communities," and Lee, Iceland, and Farrell (2014) have reported widespread increases in racial and ethnic diversity (as measured by the entropy score) across the urban hierarchy. Metropolitan areas, in particular, exhibit many different patterns of racial and ethnic diversity, which arguably shape place-to-place differences in Hispanic intermarriage patterns.

A racially diverse metropolitan area promotes opportunities for interracial contact, friendship, and marriage, compared to less diverse metropolitan areas. A diverse local Hispanic population—one comprised of many different national origin groups—may also increase opportunities for intra-ethnic contact, just as large concentrations of Hispanic immigrants may increase marital opportunities for native-born Hispanics. We therefore expect that a higher local percentage of Hispanics will be associated with lower rates of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, and with different Hispanic national origin groups and other racial minorities. Larger concentrations of racial minorities, such as blacks or Asians, will instead heighten opportunities for intermarriage between Hispanics and non-Hispanic minorities.

The social distance between Hispanics and other groups also may be reflected in local patterns of Hispanic residential segregation, racial income inequality, and Hispanic educational gaps. For example, Hispanics remain highly segregated on average from non-Hispanic whites (Lichter, Parisi, & Taquino, 2015; Logan & Stults, 2011). In 2010, the average metropolitan Hispanic/non-Hispanic white segregation score was roughly 50, meaning that 50 percent of Hispanics would have to move to another neighborhood to achieve the same percentage of Hispanics across all neighborhoods. Hispanic residential segregation from whites is negatively associated with the probability of intermarriage with whites (Lichter et al., 2007). Conversely, residential integration of Hispanics with blacks suggests a greater likelihood of interracial marriage between blacks and Hispanics. These spatially divergent patterns of Hispanic segregation from whites and blacks may reinforce classic patterns of marital assimilation or, alternately, lead to a new kind of segmented assimilation, especially if Hispanics increasingly out-marry with other racial minorities.

Greater income equality between Hispanics and whites similarly suggests greater economic incorporation of Hispanics into the majority population. We expect that metropolitan areas with greater Hispanic income equality relative to either whites or blacks will have higher rates of intermarriage. Similar levels of income imply comparable levels of education, job skills, and other human capital characteristics. Greater equality among groups presumably raises the likelihood of more contact opportunities across groups; and, by extension, higher rates of Hispanic intermarriage with non-Hispanics—white or black.

Finally, Hispanics have lower educational attainment, on average, than other racial or ethnic groups (Fry & Parker, 2012), which represents a clear impediment to social integration (Waters & Pinceau, 2016). The implication is clear: in metropolitan areas where Hispanics overall are more highly educated than average, Hispanics may also be more highly integrated with the majority population and intermarriage rates may increase accordingly. Significantly, this may occur independently of individual educational levels. At the metropolitan level, a more highly-educated Hispanic population presumably promotes more cross-cutting social circles—in employment, organizations, and neighborhoods. Larger shares of Hispanics are likely to out-marry in metropolitan areas where Hispanics are, on average, more highly educated and therefore have more opportunities to form marital unions that cross ethnoracial boundaries. This structural argument is compatible with micro-level studies showing that out-marriage among racial and ethnic minority populations increases with higher levels of education (Qian & Lichter, 2011; Rosenfeld, 2007).

That intermarriage is subject to local-level marriage market opportunities and constraints is both self-evident and clearly revealed in the geographic dispersal of Hispanics from traditional immigrant gateways (e.g., Los Angeles or Houston) to other metropolitan areas where whites or other minority populations are predominant and where immigrant institutions are weak or underdeveloped (Lichter et al., 2015; Waters & Pinceau, 2016). Indeed, the new spatial diffusion of Hispanics may lead to higher levels of intermarriage in new destinations if spatial assimilation reflects and reinforces social and economic integration. Local marriage market opportunities to marry co-ethnics may be limited, while exposure to other population groups may be greater than ever.

Conversely, traditional gateways are often distinguished by the availability of more community resources, greater social cohesion, and more extensive friendship and kinship networks, which support assimilation and upward mobility among native-born and immigrant Hispanics alike. Such conditions encourage endogamy. Moreover, marriages between native- and foreign-born Hispanics are likely to be commonplace, reflecting shared opportunities for social interaction and cohesion. Theoretically, these patterns are distinct from those in "new destinations," which include disproportionate shares of Hispanic immigrants who, compared to Hispanics in traditional gateways, may be positively selected on socioeconomic status (Lichter & Johnson, 2009). In such cases, we would expect a greater likelihood of marriage outside the Hispanic pan-ethnicity (i.e., higher socioeconomic status "whitens"; see Schwartzman (2007)). A recent study by Campbell and Martin (2015), in fact, showed that a larger local Hispanic immigrant population was associated with less marital endogamy and more out-marriage.

Other studies, however, suggest that the spatial dispersal of Hispanics does not easily translate into socioeconomic integration or greater residential exposure to whites. In fact, the movement into new destinations may lead to the formation of new ethnic enclaves, which then become collecting grounds for economically-disadvantaged Hispanics and where opportunities for intermarriage are highly circumscribed spatially. Indeed, previous studies have reported higher rates of Hispanic segregation from whites in new destinations than in established gateways (Hall, 2013; Lichter, Parisi, Taquino, & Grice, 2010). Large influxes in Hispanic immigrants, along with greater income inequality with native-born whites, may also lead to more diverse or segmented patterns of integration. In this case, the argument that spatial assimilation, as measured by movement into new destinations, leads to more intermarriage with whites may be overstated. The formation of new ethnic enclaves outside traditional gateway may instead contribute to more endogamy, not less.

Current Study

America's rapidly growing and racially diverse Hispanic population may well integrate along racial and ethnic lines, with white Hispanics disproportionately likely to marry non-Hispanic whites, and non-white Hispanics more likely to marry non-Hispanic non-whites. As we have argued here, a single mode of integration or assimilation among Hispanics is much less plausible today than it has been in the past (Alba and Nee 2003). Growing diversity in the Hispanic population means that integration patterns, at least as traditionally measured by out-marriage with other groups, are likely to be highly uneven, and will depend on local area marital opportunities and constraints. In this paper, we highlight today's diverse patterns of Hispanic intermarriage. As we illustrate here, marital assimilation is both facilitated and constrained by local marriage market conditions—whether Hispanics live in traditional gateways or new destinations, and the marriage market opportunities available to them.

Data and Methods

We use pooled data from the 2009–2014 annual rounds of the *American Community Survey* (ACS). The ACS replaced the long form of the 2010 decennial census, but nevertheless

includes census-like information on marriage timing, order, and marital history. Here we focus on marriages reported to occur in the past 12 months. These newly-formed marriages are linked to various metropolitan indicators of marriage market conditions.

Our empirical approach focuses on Hispanic intermarriage patterns of various types. We do not examine unmarried cohabitation; the ACS neither includes information on annual transitions into and out of cohabiting unions nor identifies when cohabitation begins (i.e., before or after arriving in the United States or a particular local marriage market). This means that our analyses are tightly focused on legal, committed, and relatively permanent unions. To be sure, excluding cohabiting unions represents a potential but unavoidable limitation of our approach, in part because previous studies suggest that interracial heterogamy is generally higher in cohabiting than married unions (Blackwell & Lichter, 2000). This means that the intermarriage patterns reported in our study may provide lower-bound estimates of "marital" assimilation. Our focus on marriage is nevertheless linked most directly to a large and growing literature on marital assimilation and immigrant integration in the United States and Europe (Rodríguez-García, 2015). Marriage confers certain legal rights and obligations that are not imposed on cohabiting couples.

Our analysis includes recent marriages in which at least one spouse is Hispanic. Hispanics may self-identify as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or another ethnic or national origin group from Latin America. Nativity is used to examine differences in intermarriage between immigrant and U.S.-born Hispanics. Our multivariate analyses also control for demographic and socioeconomic factors that influence marriage and assortative mating among Hispanics, including race (white or nonwhite), age (a continuous variable in years), educational attainment (less than high school, high school or equivalent, some college, college or more), and logged personal income (a continuous variable, adjusted for inflation to 2010 U.S. dollars).

For this study, we link these marriage records to marriage market indicators for 98 metropolitan areas with a population size of 100,000 or more and represented by at least 20 recent marriages involving a Hispanic spouse in the pooled 2009–2014 ACS data. Traditional immigrant gateways are metropolitan counties that were at least 10 percent Hispanic in 1990, 2000, and 2010 (Johnson & Lichter, 2016). We link these counties to the metropolitan areas in which they are located, and then classify all 98 metropolitan areas into two types: (1) traditional urban gateways and (2) new or emerging destinations (a residual category). We then use racial composition, exposure indices of Hispanics to whites or blacks, Hispanics' immigrant share, racial/ethnic income inequality, and the percent of Hispanics (ages 25 and over) with at least a high school education to predict the intermarriage patterns of Hispanics across metropolitan areas. We use published estimates from the 5-year 2014 ACS data to obtain the racial/ethnic composition of adults in the metropolitan area (Hispanic, non-Hispanic Black, or non-Hispanic White; age 18 or older), percent of Hispanics (age 18 or older) who were born outside the United States, and percent of Hispanics (age 25 or older) who completed high school. These characteristics are computed separately by gender. For example, the characteristics of men in a given metropolitan area are used as covariates in the analysis of Hispanic women's marriage

patterns. Percent non-Hispanic White was omitted from regression models due to collinearity with other categories of the racial/ethnic composition.

We also use the 5-year 2014 ACS data to obtain median annual household income by race/ethnicity (of the householder) for each metropolitan area. We use published estimates from the 2010 Census to identify the exposure indices of Hispanics to whites and blacks in each metropolitan area (Logan, 2011). The exposure index measures the average percentage of whites in the neighborhoods in which Hispanics live in a specific metropolitan area. A metropolitan-specific exposure index of 50, for example, means that Hispanics, on average, live in neighborhoods that are 50 percent non-Hispanic white. The exposure index ranges from 0 to 100, with a larger value indicating that a Hispanic person lives in a census tract with higher percentages of non-Hispanic whites. To assure the relevance of local marriage market characteristics as measured in our study, we exclude individuals who married outside their current state of residence at the time of the ACS interview.

We use multinomial logistic regression to estimate the association of individual characteristics, type of Hispanic destination (traditional or newly established), and metropolitan-level characteristics with the likelihood of being involved in specific types of marriage. Marriage type was defined on the basis of marrying (from the Hispanic spouse's point of view) (1) a co-ethnic, (2) a non-co-ethnic Hispanic (i.e., marriage to Hispanics outside one's own national origin group), (3) non-Hispanic white, (4) non-Hispanic black, or (5) any other spouse, with homogenous unions (category 1) used as the reference group. Model 1 includes individual variables such as age, educational attainment, race, nativity, and income, in addition to metro type (traditional gateway or new destinations). Model 2 adds specific metropolitan area characteristics to Model 1, such as racial/ethnic composition, educational composition, immigrant concentration, Hispanic residential exposures to other racial groups, and racial/ethnic economic inequality.

We perform the regression analysis separately for men and women due to gender differences in partner availability and marital preferences (Qian and Lichter 2007), and because the marriage outcomes of men and women in the sample are not independent (i.e., a marriage in which both spouses are Hispanic would contribute 2 observations to the combined analysis). We use clustered robust standard errors to account for non-independence among individuals living in the same metropolitan area. To confirm the applicability of our findings to specific Hispanic national origin groups, we re-fit the final multinomial logit models to subgroups of Mexican-origin Hispanics; Caribbean and Central American-origin Hispanics; and South American-origin Hispanics.

Results

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics of marriages formed in the previous year among Hispanics, using ACS data spanning the years 2009–2014. Among U.S.-born Hispanics, 41% of the men married U.S.-born co-ethnic women while 37% of the women married U.S.-born co-ethnic men. In other words, most U.S.-born Hispanics (59% of men and 63% of women) were involved in some form of intermarriage — about 12% of men and 15% of women married foreign-born co-ethnics; 12% of men and 14% of women married other

Hispanics (natives and immigrants combined); 28% married non-Hispanic whites; and about 7% married blacks, Asians, or others. Intermarriage is unusually commonplace among U.S.-born Hispanics, and any gender differences in out-marriage are small.

Compared with native-born Hispanics, foreign-born Hispanics show higher rates of marital endogamy. Over half of them (51% of men and 55% of women, respectively) married foreign-born co-ethnic spouses. These percentages are perhaps unsurprising, but nevertheless clearly indicate that the pool of potential partners is restricted among Hispanic immigrants. Seventeen percent of these Hispanic men and 13% of Hispanic women married U.S.-born co-ethnic spouses. Notably more foreign-born Hispanics (about 13%) married foreign-born spouses from another Hispanic national origin group. Shared Spanish language and Catholic religion undoubtedly provide common ground between foreign-born Hispanics originating from different countries. Intermarriage between different national origin groups presumably reflects opportunities for interaction among Hispanic immigrants living in the same neighborhoods or occupational niches. Foreign-born Hispanics, however, were less likely to marry non-Hispanic whites, intermarrying at roughly one-third the rate of U.S.-born Hispanics. These results reveal strong nativity differences in intermarriage, with proportionally more U.S.- than foreign-born Hispanics marrying non-Hispanics, and more foreign- than U.S.-born Hispanics marrying foreign-born Hispanics of a different national origin group.

Table 1 also compares marriage patterns among Hispanics living in traditional gateways and new destinations. As expected, Hispanics living in traditional gateways were far more likely than Hispanics living in new destinations to be in endogamous marriages. Indeed, Hispanics in traditional gateways had lower percentages of intermarriage of any type. Of course, these spatial differences in intermarriage may be due to compositional or demographic differences, such as age or education, or reflect marriage market conditions (i.e., differences in the availability of demographically-similar potential spouses).

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for Hispanics in the ACS who married in the previous year. The average age for men was 31 and the average age for women was 29. Most Hispanics (62% of men and 64% of women) identified as white. Only 2% of Hispanic men and women identified as black. Darker skinned Hispanics include mestizos, mulattos, or other mixed race individuals who identify as "other" race or belong to more than one racial group (Frank, Akresh, and Lu 2010). More than one half of all Hispanic men and women were U.S.-born (51% and 55%, respectively). Hispanic women, on average, had more educational attainment than their male counterparts—45% of men and 54% of women had attended or completed college. Despite Hispanic women's educational advantage, their median personal income was about one-half of men's. As expected, much higher percentages of women than men were not in the labor force (30% versus 8%). Yet, our estimate of median income indicates that half of women had incomes greater than $14,000, which was only about $2,000 above the one-person poverty threshold in 2010. These data provide little evidence that newly-married Hispanics settling in new destinations are positively selected on more socioeconomic status.

Table 3 highlights variation in marriage market conditions in new and established metro destinations. Of our 98 metropolitan areas, 35 are classified as traditional gateways and the rest are considered to be new or emerging destinations. The median metropolitan area was14% Hispanic, 71% non-Hispanic white, and 7% non-Hispanic black. Median exposure indices of Hispanics to whites and blacks were 46 and 11, respectively. As expected, new destinations included far smaller shares of Hispanics than do traditional gateways (9–10% versus 31–33%). It is not surprising that Hispanics in new destinations were more highly exposed to both whites and blacks (exposure indices of 53 and 15, respectively, in new destinations versus 31 and 5 in traditional gateways). The demographic opportunities for interracial marriage were much greater in new destinations. New destinations also had slightly lower median incomes among Hispanics ($39,346 versus $42,882) but much lower levels of income among blacks than whites, which seemingly incentivized Hispanic marriages with whites over blacks. New destinations also included larger shares of foreign-born people (49–53% versus 45–46%), which may influence opportunities for cross-generation intermarriage. Differences in percentages of Hispanics completing high school, however, were surprisingly small (63–68% versus 62–64%).

To better understand how these individual characteristics and metropolitan marriage market conditions contribute to diverse patterns of intermarriage, Table 4 presents results from multinomial logistic regression models of intermarriage among Hispanic men. Here, we present odds ratios of variables predicting alternative marriage types vis-à-vis Hispanic marital endogamy (i.e., marriage between Hispanics sharing the same national origin). Model 1 includes individual-level variables plus metro-type (a traditional gateway versus a new destination area). With increases in age, men were significantly more likely to intermarry than to marry a co-ethnic female. A one-year increase in men's age was associated with a 1% increase in the odds of marriage to a non-co-ethnic Hispanic. Among Hispanic men, delayed marriage is seemingly associated with "casting a wider net." Race is another important predictor of intermarriage. As expected, Hispanic men who identify as white were much less likely to marry blacks or other racial minorities than their non-white counterparts. The odds of marriage to blacks and other minorities among white Hispanic men were, respectively, 75% and 63% lower than nonwhite Hispanics. Nativity also influences their choice of spouses. The odds of marrying a non-co-ethnic Hispanic rather than a co-ethnic Hispanic were 40% greater among immigrant Hispanic men than among U.S.-born Hispanic men; and the odds of marrying non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, and other racial minorities were 62%, 59%, and 64% lower, respectively, among immigrant Hispanic men compared to U.S.-born Hispanic men.

Clearly, Hispanic men's nativity and race shape their paths of integration in American society. Hispanic immigrants typically speak the same language, share the Catholic faith, and live in similar neighborhoods, which enhances contact and, by extension, promotes intermarriage with Hispanics of different national origins. Hispanic immigrants also have far fewer opportunities to interact with non-Hispanics, including whites, blacks, or other minority groups, compared to their U.S.-born counterparts. The diversity of pathways to integration, as revealed here in recent marriage patterns, underscores the continuing salience of race in America, even among new immigrant groups. White Hispanics are highly unlikely to marry non-Hispanic blacks or other racial minorities.

For Hispanic men, educational attainment was positively associated with out-marriage to non-co-ethnic Hispanics, non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, and other racial minorities. This educational effect was revealed most clearly in the greater likelihood of marriage to non-Hispanic whites or to partners from another racial minority group. The odds of marrying a white rather than a co-ethnic were 7.46 times greater for Hispanic men with completed college than for Hispanic men without a high school education. Less striking educational gradients were observed in patterns of intermarriage with non-co-ethnic Hispanics or blacks. Income (as well as labor force participation, not included in Table 4) was not significantly associated with intermarriage among Hispanic men, apart from higher incomes predicting less intermarriage with non-Black and non-Hispanic minorities.

The last variable in Model 1 is metropolitan area type. Net of individual factors, Hispanic men living in new destinations were more likely to intermarry than those living in traditional gateways. This effect was strong and statistically significant for intermarriage with co-pan-ethnics, non-Hispanic whites, blacks, and other racial minorities. The odds of each type of intermarriage were, respectively, 1.63, 2.27, 2.44, and 1.61 times greater in new destinations than in traditional gateways. Clearly, the opportunities for intermarriage were much greater in new than in established destinations.

To understand why, we turn to Model 2 (Table 4), which examines whether aggregate-level differences among metropolitan areas, including differences in marriage market conditions, account for the increased propensity to intermarry among Hispanics in new destinations. Model 2 adds several metropolitan-level variables: percentage of blacks, percentage of Hispanics, percentage of foreign-born Hispanics, percentage of Hispanics completing high school (among those age 25 years or older), Hispanic exposure index to whites and to blacks, absolute income difference between whites and Hispanics (in thousands), and absolute income difference between Hispanics and blacks (in thousands). Changes in likelihood ratio statistic support the descriptive analysis that metropolitan-area variations were strong (also see Kalmijn and Van Tubergen 2010)

The inclusion of these metro variables in Model 2 renders the coefficients for metropolitan area type smaller and statistically insignificant. This means that the higher rates of intermarriage for Hispanics in new destinations, as shown in Model 1, were largely explained by the differences in the marriage market conditions, as measured by metropolitan area characteristics. From a demographic standpoint, traditional gateways seemingly promote marital endogamy among Hispanics, while the demographic and economic diversity found in new destinations paves the way for more Hispanic intermarriage—of all kinds.

While racial composition of a metropolitan area (percent of non-Hispanic black women and percent of Hispanic women) does not have a significant effect, the nativity and educational compositions do. The odds ratios of marrying non-co-ethnic Hispanics, non-Hispanics whites, and other racial minorities relative to co-ethnic Hispanics were, respectively, 3%, 1%, and 3% higher for each percent point increase in the percent of foreign-born Hispanic women. Meanwhile, the share of Hispanics with at least a high school education was also positively associated with intermarriage with Hispanic partners of different national origins and with non-Hispanic blacks. Higher metro proportions of foreign-born Hispanics and

more Hispanics with at least a high school education presumably increased contact opportunities, promoted pan-ethnic identities, and resulted in greater pan-ethnic marriages.

In metro areas where exposure to whites is high, Hispanic men were more likely to intermarry with white women, as expected. A 1% increase in the exposure index to blacks also increased the odds of Hispanic men's marriage with blacks by 9% and with other Hispanics by 6%. In light of the strong effect of individual race (Model 1, Table 4), these findings suggest that darker-skinned Hispanics with greater exposure to African Americans may be more likely to marry blacks and other darker skinned Hispanics (i.e., those who self-identify as non-white). Finally, income inequality also shapes the likelihood of intermarriage among Hispanic men. Indeed, the greater the local area income inequality was between Hispanics and whites, the more likely Hispanic men were to marry other Hispanic women (by 3% for a $1000 increase in the income difference) rather than white women.

Table 5 presents parallel results for Hispanic women. The results are similar to those of Hispanic men, suggesting that gender differences in predictors of intermarriage among Hispanics are relatively small. Yet, there are some notable discrepancies between Hispanic women and men. First, Hispanic women who marry at older ages were much more likely to out-marry, i.e., to experience all forms of intermarriage. For example, a 1-year increase in age for Hispanic women raised the odds of marrying non-Hispanic white men by 3% and the odds of marrying non-Hispanic black men by 3%, relative to marrying their co-ethnic counterparts. As Hispanic women age, they "cast a wider net." Second, the effect of income was generally not statistically significant for Hispanic men, but highly significant for Hispanic women. A 1% increase in Hispanic women's income increased the odds of marrying non-co-ethnic Hispanics, whites, blacks, and other racial minorities relative to marrying co-ethnics, by 3%, 4%, 6%, and 4%, respectively. Given that a significant portion of Hispanic women were not in the labor force (Table 2), this finding suggests that employed Hispanic women were more likely to intermarry than their non-employed counterparts. Income and socioeconomic status were strong predictors of intermarriage for Hispanic women.

Due to differences in ethnoracial intermarriage by country of origin, we also conducted sensitivity analyses by disaggregating Hispanics into three separate groups: Mexicans, Caribbean/Central Americans, and South Americans. We replicated the models in Tables 4 and 5 (see results in Appendix Tables 1 and 2). The positive age effect on all types of intermarriage was stronger among Mexicans than among Hispanics (including Caribbean/ Central and South Americans). The results also reveal that there was a residual difference between traditional gateways and new destinations when predicting the intermarriage of both Mexican men and women, after accounting for local marriage market conditions. This suggests that both local marriage market conditions and other unobserved attributes of Mexicans contribute to more intermarriage among Mexicans living in new destinations.

Discussion and Conclusion

In recent decades, a large influx of immigrants from Mexico and other Latin American countries, along with high fertility rates, have made Hispanics the fastest growing population

in the U.S. (Lichter, Johnson, Turner, & Churilla, 2012). Hispanics are diverse, originating from many different countries in Latin America. Hispanics, as a pan-ethnic group, do not fit neatly within the current racial hierarchy system in the U.S. (Frank, Akresh, & Lu, 2010). Yet, their rapid growth and comparatively low socioeconomic status have put them in a unique position among racial/ethnic minority groups. Given their extraordinary diversity—in nativity, race, and socioeconomic status—recent Hispanic immigrants and their children may not follow straightforward or conventional patterns of cultural and economic incorporation into American society. Immigrant populations and racial minorities are unlikely to experience a single mode of assimilation, in contrast to the experiences of European immigrants to the U.S. at the turn of the twentieth century. Instead, contemporary assimilation—including marital assimilation—may take multiple paths and depend on social context, including the opportunities available for out-marriage to whites and co-ethnic natives.

Using data from the 2009–2014 *American Community Surveys*, we focused on marriages formed in the previous year and explored mate selection patterns among Hispanic men and women. Specifically, we investigated whether they marry their Hispanic co-ethnics (i.e., Hispanics who share the same national origins), other Hispanics (with dissimilar national origins), non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, or other racial minorities. Our analysis revealed, first and foremost, that intermarriage among Hispanics is extraordinarily common, especially among the U.S. native-born population, of which three-fifths are involved in some form of intermarriage. Hispanic intermarriage is not just limited to whites. This pattern suggests that Hispanics are not an isolated group and have substantial contact opportunities with diverse racial and ethnic populations. In some ways, Hispanics serve as an associational bridge that, through marriage, stitches together many different racial and ethnic strands in American society. Hispanic marriage patterns blur the color line.

Our analysis also showed that the racial background of Hispanics is associated with diverse pathways to marriage and, by implication, incorporation and integration. U.S.-born white Hispanics are more likely to marry non-Hispanic whites than U.S.-born non-white Hispanics. This contrasts with patterns of intermarriage among U.S.-born non-white Hispanics, who are more likely to marry non-Hispanic blacks and other racial minorities than U.S.-born white Hispanics. Hispanics are typically considered as a racial monolith, but our results show that racial background clearly matters for marital assimilation, presumably because it shapes marital opportunities—in neighborhoods, schools, and the workplace. The results suggest that Hispanic integration in America is highly segmented, and subject to existing racial realities in American society (Lichter, 2013). On the balance, our analysis demonstrated that current marriage patterns both diminish and reinforce existing racial boundaries in the United States. High rates of intermarriage with some groups (especially whites) are countered by low rates for other groups.

"Hispanic," a pan-ethnic label, has been created, recognized, and widely accepted in the United States (Mora, 2014). Interestingly, U.S.-born Hispanics do not always embrace pan-ethnicity to the same degree as immigrant Hispanics, at least as measured in their choice of spouses. Our analysis revealed that Hispanic immigrants are more likely than their U.S.-born counterparts to marry non-co-ethnic Hispanics. The reasons are undoubtedly rooted in

demography: U.S.-born Mexicans and Salvadorans may have fewer opportunities to meet each other than foreign-born Mexicans and Salvadorans who share the same neighborhoods. Commonalities of language and religion further reduce social distance and facilitate relationships between such groups. As we have shown here, growing pan-ethnicity in America reinforces Hispanic out-marriage to other national origin populations.

A fundamental assumption of our study is that local marriage markets—metropolitan areas in our case—provide a spatial and social arena for intermarriage of all types. The geographic dispersal of Hispanics from established destinations to new destinations has alternately been viewed as a sign of spatial integration and as an indicator of concentrated disadvantage and ghettoization (in poor neighborhoods or rural areas). Our findings indicated that Hispanics in new destinations are more likely to intermarry than those in traditional gateways. This pattern was explained by taking into account marriage market conditions (e.g., racial diversity, exposure, etc.), a result that suggests that new destinations are especially favorable to intermarriage. Greater Hispanic out-marriage in new destinations is not due to selective in-migration of Hispanics with traits commonly linked to intermarriage (e.g., education). Rather, higher intermarriage rates in new destinations are rooted in marriage market conditions—greater proportions of Hispanics who are immigrants and greater exposure to diverse populations, including native-born whites and blacks (Blau, 1977; Kalmijn & Van Tubergen, 2010).

Our theoretical and empirical approach is not without limitations, even though the new *American Community Survey* provides unprecedented opportunities for tracking recent marriage patterns among immigrants. Still, our results and conclusions for Hispanics living in large metropolitan areas may be unrepresentative of the experiences of all Hispanics and risk overly simplistic generalizations about alternative pathways to incorporation. The geography of marriage and intermarriage is undoubtedly much more diverse than the one portrayed here for Hispanics. Sample sizes permitting, it will become increasingly important to identify specific Hispanic national origin populations in specific metropolitan areas (e.g., Dominicans in Reading, Puerto Ricans in Rochester, or Mexicans in Laredo or Las Vegas) who face unique contexts of reception and exclusion by the majority population. As such, our empirical analysis, although informative, represents a first step rather than final answers to important questions today about Hispanic intermarriage and integration (or not). Moreover, our effort to identify the role of local marriage market constraints was perhaps considered at the expense of better understanding the role of marital preferences (under different marriage market constraints and opportunities).

Our study is a call for research on intermarriage as a key dimension of social and economic integration (see Waters and Pineau 2016), one with greater sensitivity to different Hispanic populations with different immigration histories, different resettlement patterns through the United States, and different kinds of exposure to whites and other minority groups (in different residential, employment, and institutional contexts). Our results for Hispanics—a broadly defined and diverse pan-ethnic population—clearly revealed multiple pathways to marital assimilation and incorporation in the United States. These different paths may alternately amplify or weaken national origin boundaries, promote or dampen a sense of pan-ethnicity among Hispanics, and strengthen or breakdown racial and ethnic boundaries.

As America moves toward a majority-minority society (Frey 2015; Lichter 2013), our analysis of emerging forms of Hispanic intermarriage suggests that future national patterns of inter-group contact and marital assimilation will unfold unevenly across geographic space.

Acknowledgments

References

Alba, RD., Nee, V. Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2003.

Blackwell DL, Lichter DT. Mate Selection Among Married and Cohabiting Couples. Journal of Family Issues. 2000; 21:275–302. DOI: 10.1177/019251300021003001

Blau, PM. Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure. New York: Free Press; 1977.

Blau PM, Beeker C, Fitzpatrick KM. Intersecting Social Affiliations and Intermarriage. Social Forces. 1984; 62:585–606.

Campbell ME, Martin MA. Race, Immigration, and Exogamy among the Native-born: Variation across Communities. Sociology of Race and Ethnicity. 2016; 2:142–161. DOI: 10.1177/2332649215598786

Choi KH, Tienda M. Marriage-Market Constraints and Mate-Selection Behavior: Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Differences in Intermarriage. Journal of Marriage and Family. 2017; 79:301–317. DOI: 10.1111/jomf.12346 [PubMed: 28579638]

Espiritu, YL. Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities. Philadelphia: Temple University Press; 1992.

Frank R, Akresh IR, Lu B. Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order: How and Where Do They Fit In? American Sociological Review. 2010; 75:378–401. DOI: 10.1177/0003122410372216

Frey, WH. Diversity explosion: How new racial demographics are remaking America. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2014.

Fry, R., Parker, KP. Record Shares of Young Adults Have Finished Both High School and College. Washington DC: Pew Research Center; 2012.

Furtado D, Song T. Intermarriage and Socioeconomic Integration: Trends in Earnings Premiums among U.S. Immigrants Who Marry Natives. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 2015; 662(1):207–222. DOI: 10.1177/0002716215594629

Gordon, MM. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press; 1964.

Hall M. Residential Integration on the New Frontier: Immigrant Segregation in Established and New Destinations. Demography. 2013; 50(5):1873–1896. DOI: 10.1007/s13524-012-0177-x [PubMed: 23192394]

Harris DR, Ono H. How Many Interracial Marriages Would There Be if All Groups Were of Equal Size in All Places? A New Look at National Estimates of Interracial Marriage. Social Science Research. 2004; 34:236–251. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.01.002

Jiménez TR. Mexican Immigrant Replenishment and the Continuing Significance of Ethnicity and Race. American Journal of Sociology. 2008; 113:1527–1567. DOI: 10.1086/587151

Johnson KM, Lichter DT. Diverging Demography: Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Contributions to U.S. Population Redistribution and Diversity. Population Research and Policy Review. 2016; 35:705–725. DOI: 10.1007/s11113-016-9403-3

Kalmijn M, Van Tubergen F. A Comparative Perspective on Intermarriage: Explaining Differences among National-Origin Groups in the United States. Demography. 2010; 47:459–479. DOI: 10.1353/dem.0.0103 [PubMed: 20608106]

Lee, BA., Iceland, J., Farrell, CR. Is Ethnoracial Residential Integration on the Rise? Evidence from Metropolitan and Micropolitan America since 1980. In: Logan, J., editor. Diversity and Disparities: America Enters a New Century. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2014. p. 415-456.

Lichter DT. Integration or fragmentation? Racial diversity and the american future. Demography. 2013; 50(2):359–391. DOI: 10.1007/s13524-013-0197-1 [PubMed: 23440733]

Lichter DT, Brown JB, Qian Z, Carmalt JH. Marital Assimilation among Hispanics: Evidence of Declining Cultural and Economic Incorporation? Social Science Quarterly. 2007; 88:745–765. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2007.00481.x

Lichter DT, Carmalt JH, Qian Z. Immigration and Intermarriage among Hispanics: Crossing Racial and Generational Boundaries. Sociological Forum. 2011; 26:241–264.

Lichter DT, Johnson KM. Immigrant Gateways and Hispanic Migration to New Destinations. International Migration Review. 2009; 43:496–518. DOI: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00775.x

Lichter DT, Johnson KM, Turner RN, Churilla A. Hispanic Assimilation and Fertility in New Destinations. International Migration Review. 2012; 46(4):767–791. DOI: 10.1111/imre.12000 [PubMed: 23325987]

Lichter DT, Parisi D, Taquino MC. Spatial Assimilation in US Cities and Communities? Emerging Patterns of Hispanic Segregation from Blacks and Whites. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 2015; 660(1):36–56. DOI: 10.1177/0002716215572995

Lichter DT, Parisi D, Taquino MC, Grice SM. Residential Segregation in New Hispanic Destinations: Cities, Suburbs, and Rural Communities Compared. Social Science Research. 2010; 39(2):215–230. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.08.006

Lieberson, S. A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1980.

Logan, JR. Separate and Unequal: The Neighborhood Gap for Blacks, Hispanics and Asians in Metropolitan America. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2011.

Logan JR, Stults BJ. The Persistence of Segregation in the Metropolis: New Findings from the 2010 Census. Census Brief prepared for Project US2010. 2011

Logan JR, Zhang C. Global Neighborhoods: New Pathways to Diversity and Separation. American Journal of Sociology. 2010; 115(4):1069–1109. DOI: 10.1086/649498

Mora, GC. Making Hispanics: How Activists, Bureaucrats, and Media Constructed a New American. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2014.

Pagnini DL, Morgan SP. Intermarriage and Social Distance among U.S. Immigrants at the Turn of the Century. American Journal of Sociology. 1990; 96:405–432. DOI: 10.1086/229534

Portes A, Zhou M. The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. 1993; 530:74–96. DOI: 10.1177/0002716293530001006

Qian Z, Cobas JA. Latinos' Mate Selection: Variations by National Origin, Race, and Nativity. Social Science Research. 2004; 33:225–247. DOI: 10.1016/S0049-089X(03)00055-3

Qian Z, Glick JE, Batson CD. Crossing boundaries: nativity, ethnicity, and mate selection. Demography. 2012; 49(2):651–675. DOI: 10.1007/s13524-012-0090-3 [PubMed: 22350840]

Qian Z, Lichter DT. Social Boundaries and Marital Assimilation: Interpreting Trends in Racial and Ethnic Intermarriage. American Sociological Review. 2007; 72:68–94. DOI: 10.1177/000312240707200104

Qian Z, Lichter DT. Changing Patterns of Interracial Marriage in a Multiracial Society. Journal of Marriage and Family. 2011; 73:1065–1084. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00866.x

Rodríguez-García D. Intermarriage and Integration Revisited: International Experiences and Cross-Disciplinary Approaches. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 2015; 662(1):8–36. DOI: 10.1177/0002716215601397

Rosenfeld MJ. A Critique of Exchange Theory in Mate Selection. American Journal of Sociology. 2005; 110:1284–1325. DOI: 10.1086/428441

Rosenfeld, MJ. The Age of Independence: Interracial Unions, Same-Sex Unions, and the Changing American Family. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2007.

Schwartzman LF. Does Money Whiten? Intergenerational Changes in Racial Classification in Brazil. American Sociological Review. 2007; 72(6):940–963. DOI: 10.1177/000312240707200605

Wang, W. The Rise of Intermarriage: Rates, Characteristics Vary by Race and Gender. New York: Pew Research Center; 2012.

Waters, MC., Pinceau, MG., editors. The Integration of Immigrants into American Society. National Academy of Sciences; 2016.

Table 1

Racial and Nativity Compositions of Spouses To Whom Hispanics Married the Previous Year by Gender and Nativity, 2009–2014

	Percent of marriages, by spouse's race, ethnicity, and nativity								
	Hispanic								
	Co-ethnic		Co-pan-ethnic						
	US born	Foreign born	US born	Foreign born	White	Black	Asian	All others	Total count
All Metropolitan Areas									
US born Hispanics									
Men	41.0	11.8	8.1	4.1	27.7	1.8	2.9	2.6	5,393
Women	37.2	14.7	7.4	5.2	27.8	4.2	1.1	2.3	5,939
Foreign born Hispanics									
Men	17.0	51.3	6.0	12.7	10.2	0.9	1.3	0.6	5,135
Women	13.2	54.7	4.6	13.5	11.0	1.5	0.7	0.9	4,817
Traditional gateways									
US born Hispanics									
Men	45.1	13.4	7.9	3.5	23.6	1.4	3.1	2.0	3,655
Women	40.9	15.8	7.2	4.6	24.6	3.4	1.3	2.3	4,027
Foreign born Hispanics									
Men	19.5	52.9	5.6	11.4	7.8	0.8	1.4	0.5	3,259
Women	15.9	56.1	4.2	12.1	8.9	1.3	0.8	0.7	3,070
New destinations									
US born Hispanics									
Men	32.5	8.3	8.6	5.4	36.2	2.8	2.4	3.7	1,738
Women	29.6	12.4	7.8	6.5	34.5	5.9	0.9	2.4	1,912
Foreign born Hispanics									
Men	12.7	48.6	6.6	14.9	14.3	1.1	1.0	0.9	1,876
Women	8.3	52.1	5.4	16.0	14.7	1.8	0.5	1.2	1,747

Table 2

Characteristics of Hispanics Married in the Previous Year, 2009–2014 American Community Survey

	All areas		Traditional Gateways		New Destinations	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	Percent or median	Percent or median	Percent or median	Percent or median	Percent or median	Percent or median
Age	31	29	31	29	31	30
Race (%)						
White	61.9	64.2	61.6	63.4	64.5	65.7
Black	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.5	2.5	2.1
Other	36.2	34.1	368	35.1	35.0	32.2
Nativity (%)						
US born	51.2	55 2	52.9	56 7	48.1	52.3
Foreign born	48.8	44.8	47.1	43.3	51.9	47.7
Educational attainment (%)						
Less than HS diploma	26.8	20.8	26.6	209	27.0	20.5
HS or equivalent	28.4	25.1	28.6	25.2	28.0	24.9
Some college, less than 4 year degree	28.8	31.8	28.7	320	29.0	31.5
4-year college degree	16.1	22.3	16.1	21.9	16.0	23.1
Income (personal, in 2010 USD)	26,750	14,000	27,024	14,000	25,904	14,300
Labor force participation (%)						
Not in labor force	7.7	29.9	7.4	30.4	8.2	28.9
Employed	854	62.1	8S.8	61.6	84.8	63.2
Unemployed	6.9	8.0	6.8	8.0	70	7.9

Table 3

Characteristics of metropolitan areas, by metropolitan area type

	All areas	Traditional gateways	New destinations
	Median	Median	Median
Racial composition[a]			
% Non-Hispanic White			
Men	72	62	78
Women	71	62	77
% Non-Hispanic Black			
Men	7	3	11
Women	7	3	12
% Hispanic			
Men	14	33	10
Women	14	31	9
Exposure index of Hispanics[b]			
To Whites	46	31	53
To Blacks	11	5	15
Median household income by race/ethnicity of head of household[a]			
Non-Hispanic White	60,471	61,550	60,169
Non-Hispanic Black	36,539	41,913	34,275
Hispanic	40,067	42,882	39,346
Percent of Hispanics born abroad[a]			
Men	50	46	53
Women	48	45	49
Percent of Hispanics who completed high school[a]			
Men	63	62	63
Women	67	64	68

[a]Source: 2014 5-year ACS estimates.

[b]Source: 2010 US Census, American Communities Project.

Table 4

Odds Ratio of Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting Intermarriage Type among Hispanic Men Married in the Previous Year, 2009–2014

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorites vs. Coethnic	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorites vs. Coethnic
Individual-Level								
Age	1.01 ***	1.01	1.01 *	1.01	1.01 **	1.01 *	1.01	1.01
Race								
White	0.94	0.99	0.25 ***	0.37 ***	0.95	1.06	0.28 ***	0.39 ***
Nonwhite								
Nativity								
Native								
Immigrant	1.40 ***	0.38 ***	0.41 ***	0.36 ***	1.14	0.32 ***	0.33 ***	0.31 ***
Education								
Less than high school								
High school	1.66 ***	2.22 ***	1.83	2.85 ***	1.55 ***	2.28 ***	1.80	2.89 ***
Some college	2.37 ***	3.61 ***	2.85 **	5.29 ***	2.25 ***	4.03 ***	3.20 ***	5.62 ***
College or more	3.07 ***	8.46 ***	3.57 ***	10.42 ***	2.48 ***	8.74 ***	3.35 ***	10.36 ***
Logged income	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.96 *	0.99	1.00	0.98	0.96 *
Metropolian Area								
Traditional Gateways								
New Destinations	1.63 *	2.27 ***	2.44 **	1.61 *	1.24	1.13	1.03	1.15
Metro-Level								
Percent non-Hispanic Black[a]					0.97	1.01	0.98	0.98
Percent Hispanic[a]					1.02	0.99	0.95	1.01
Percent foreign-born Hispanic[a]					1.03 ***	1.01 ***	1.01	1.03 ***
Percent Hispanic with completed high school[a]					1.04 ***	1.01	1.04 **	1.00
Exposure to whites					1.02	1.04 ***	0.99	1.03
Exposure to blacks					1.06 ***	1.00	1.09 *	1.02

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorites vs. Coethnic	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorites vs. Coethnic
Income difference between Hispanics and whites					1.03 **	1.01	1.00	1.01
Income difference between Hispanics and blacks					0.99	0.99	1.00	0.99
Sample Size		10410				10410		
Degrees of freedom		32				64		
Likelihood ratio		2042				9824		

***
p<.001

**
p<.01

*
p<.05

[a]Data calculated for women in each metropolitan area.

Significance tests are based on robust standard errors.

Table 5

Relative Risk Ratio of Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting Intermarriage Type among Hispanic Women Married in the Previous Year, 2009–2014

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Coethnic	Other Minorites vs. Coethnic	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Coethnic	Other Minorites vs. Coethnic
Individual-Level								
Age	1.01 ***	1.03 ***	1.03 ***	1.02 *	1.01 *	1.03 ***	1.03 ***	1.02 **
Race								
White	0.97	1.34 **	0.30 ***	0.43 ***	0.98	1.43 ***	0.32 ***	0.45 ***
Nonwhite								
Nativity								
Native								
Immigrant	1.33 ***	0.42 **	0.32 ***	0.45 ***	1.05	0.38 ***	0.26 ***	0.41 ***
Education								
Less than high school								
High school	1.31 **	2.42 ***	2.07 ***	1.65	1.27 **	2.48 ***	2.03 ***	1.66
Some college	1.95 ***	4.69 ***	3.19 ***	3.29 ***	1.88 ***	5.07 ***	3.33 ***	3.38 ***
College or more	3.02 ***	10.64 ***	4.44 ***	5.36 ***	2.54 ***	10.93 ***	4.20 ***	5.24 ***
Logged income	1.03 ***	1.04 ***	1.06 ***	1.04 ***	1.03 **	1.04 ***	1.06 **	1.04 ***
Metropolian Area								
Traditional Gateways								
New Destinations	1.61 *	2.01 ***	2.37 ***	1.38	1.32	1.15	1.14	1.22
Metro-Level								
Percent non-Hispanic Black[a]					0.96 *	1.01	0.98	1.03
Percent Hispanic[a]					1.02	0.99	0.96	1.05
Percent foreign-born Hispanic[a]					1.03 ***	1.01 ***	1.01	1.01
Percent Hispanic with completed high school[a]					1.04 ***	1.01	1.02 *	1.01
Exposure to whites					1.01	1.03 ***	0.99	1.05 **
Exposure to blacks					1.07 ***	0.99	1.06 *	1.00

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Coethnic	Other Minorites vs. Coethnic	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Coethnic	Other Minorites vs. Coethnic
Income difference between Hispanics and whites					1.02 **	1.01	0.99	1.03
Income difference between Hispanics and blacks					0.99	0.98 *	0.98	1.01
Sample size	10527				10527			
Degrees of freedom	32				64			
Likelihood ratio	2750				10500			

***
p<.001

**
p<.01

*
p<.05

[a]Data calculated for men in each metropolitan area.

Significance tests are based on robust standard errors.

Appendix Table 1

Odds Ratio of Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting Intermarriage Type among Hispanic Men Married in the Previous Year, 2009–2014

	Mexican				Carribean/Central American				South American			
	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorities vs. Coethnic	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorities vs. Coethnic	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorities vs. Coethnic
Individual-Level												
Age	1.02 **	1.02 ***	1.03 ***	1.02 **	0.99	0.99 ***	0.99	0.99	0.98 **	0.96 ***	0.98	0.95 *
Race												
White	0.90	0.95	0.37 ***	0.47 ***	1.19	1.26	0.24 ***	0.36 **	1.06	1.26	0.52	0.20 ***
Nonwhite												
Nativity												
Native												
Immigrant	1.16	0.24 ***	0.28 **	0.25 ***	0.97	0.38 ***	0.38 ***	0.33 ***	0.58 **	0.39 ***	3.00	0.27 *
Education												
Less than high school												
High school	1.53 ***	2.33 ***	1.89	2.99 ***	1.48 ***	2.02 ***	2.47	2.54 **	2.20	2.05	--	2.84
Some college	2.47 ***	3.73 ***	2.10	6.41 ***	1.94 ***	3.78 ***	5.20 ***	4.38 ***	2.17	3.84	1.97	5.52
College or more	2.22 ***	7.05 ***	2.04	10.55 ***	1.88 ***	8.42 ***	4.58 **	7.12 ***	1.79	5.90 **	3.15	8.04 **
Logged Income	0.99	0.97 *	0.96	0.94 ***	0.99	1.04 *	1.01	0.97	0.99	1.02	0.93	1.04
Metropolitan Area												
Traditional Gateways												
New Destinations	1.80 *	1.37 **	1.52	1.54	0.85	0.90	0.54	0.71	1.52	1.47	0.12	1.84
Metro-Level												
Percent non-Hispanic Black[a]	1.01	1.02	0.97	1.01	1.00	1.01	1.02	0.94	1.03	1.06	1.01	1.00
Percent Hispanic[a]	1.01	0.99	0.93	1.04	1.10 ***	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.06	0.98	0.87	1.01
Percent foreign-born Hispanic[a]	1.03 ***	1.01	1.01	1.04 ***	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.01	1.00	0.97 *	1.15 *	0.96 *
Percent Hispanic with completed high school[a]	1.06 ***	1.01	1.05 *	1.03	0.97 ***	0.96 ***	0.96	0.96 *	0.96 ***	0.94 ***	1.23 *	0.94
Exposure to whites	1.01	1.04 ***	0.95	1.05 *	1.05 **	1.05 **	1.04	1.03	1.04	1.02	0.97	0.98
Exposure to blacks	1.01	1.00	1.07 *	0.99	1.04	1.02	1.09	1.05	0.96	0.91 **	1.18	1.00
Income difference between Hispanics and whites	1.04 *	1.01	0.99	1.04 *	1.00	0.98	0.99	0.98 *	1.00	1.00	1.01	0.98
Income difference between Hispanics and blacks	0.98	1.00	0.96	0.97	1.01	1.02	1.02	1.04	1.02	1.03	1.36 ***	1.13
Sample Size	6584				2613				790			

***
p<.001

**
p<.01

*
p<.05

[a]Data calculated for women in each metropolitan area.

Significance tests are based on robust standard errors.

Appendix Table 2

Odds Ratio of Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting Intermarriage Type among Hispanic Women Married in the Previous Year, 2009–2014

	Mexican				Carribean/Central American				South American			
	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorities vs. Coethnic	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorities vs. Coethnic	Panethnic vs. Coethnic	White vs. Coethnic	Black vs. Co-ethnic	Other Minorities vs. Coethnic
Individual-Level												
Age	1.02 **	1.04 ***	1.06 ***	1.03 ***	0.99 **	1.01	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.96
Race												
White	0.97	1.37 ***	0.39 ***	0.51 ***	1.32 *	2.10 ***	0.38 ***	0.47 **	0.83	0.89	0.09 ***	0.14 ***
Nonwhite												
Nativity												
Native												
Immigrant	1.04	0.27 ***	0.24 ***	0.30 ***	0.77 *	0.35 ***	0.28 ***	0.34 ***	0.39 ***	0.21 ***	0.11 ***	0.54
Education												
Less than high school												
High school	1.21	2.20 ***	2.87 *	1.68	1.10	2.25 ***	2.21 *	1.39	2.29 ***	2.06	0.54	-
Some college	1.84 **	4.32 ***	5.42 ***	3.33 ***	1.51	4.62 ***	3.36 ***	3.76 ***	1.98 ***	3.64 ***	0.45	-
College or more	2.55 ***	8.53 ***	5.54 ***	5.21 ***	1.96 ***	10.06 ***	4.88 ***	5.00 ***	2.14 *	6.07 **	0.52	-
Logged Income	1.02	1.04 ***	1.07 *	1.03	1.02 *	1.07 ***	1.05 *	1.05	1.04 *	1.03	1.09	1.08
Metropolitan Area												
Traditional Gateways												
New Destinations	1.33 *	1.29 *	1.10	1.50	0.88	0.94	0.90	0.81	2.01 **	1.53	2.28	1.94
Metro-Level												
Percent non-Hispanic Black[a]	0.98	1.01	0.94	1.00	1.02	1.08 ***	1.04	1.09	0.99	0.97	1.07	0.96
Percent Hispanic[a]	1.09 **	0.99	0.93	1.06	1.08 ***	1.06 **	1.02	1.14 **	1.00	0.96	0.88	1.08
Percent foreign-born Hispanic[a]	1.05 ***	1.01	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.01	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.96 *
Percent Hispanic with completed high school[a]	1.07 ***	1.02 *	1.00	1.02	0.95 ***	0.94 ***	0.95 ***	0.95 ***	0.96 *	0.95 **	0.92 **	0.96
Exposure to whites	1.05 *	1.03 *	0.97	1.05	1.04 **	1.07 ***	1.03	1.10 ***	0.99	1.00	0.92	0.96
Exposure to blacks	1.09 ***	0.99	1.09 *	1.01	1.00	0.97	1.02	0.99	0.95	0.93	0.85 *	1.14
Income difference between Hispanics and whites	1.03 *	1.01	0.99	1.04 *	0.99	0.99	0.96 *	1.01	1.01	0.99	0.97	0.98
Income difference between Hispanics and blacks	0.99	0.98 *	0.99	1.00	1.02	0.98	0.97	1.09 **	1.01	1.00	0.92	1.15 ***
Sample Size	6543				2566				948			

*** p<.001

**
p<.01

*
p<.05

[a]Data calculated for men in each metropolitan area.

Significance tests are based on robust standard errors.