

Interracial Marriage: Social Connection, Marital Conflict and Divorce

by

Rose M. Kreider

US Census Bureau

Rose.Kreider@census.gov

Previously presented at the American Sociological Association meetings, August, 2000 in

Washington, DC

This paper reports the results of research and analysis undertaken by Census Bureau staff. It has undergone a more limited review than official Census Bureau publications. This report is released to inform interested parties of research and to encourage discussion. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau.

This paper is based on my dissertation in Sociology written at the University of Maryland, College Park. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the US Census Bureau.

Abstract 88 words

Using both waves of the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), this paper examines the relative stability of interracial and same race marriages. The NSFH contains measures of the degree of connection with family members and marital conflict, factors which can help explain why interracial marriages are more likely to disrupt than endogamous marriages. Although interracial marriages are more likely to disrupt than endogamous marriages, being in an interracial marriage is a less important predictor of disruption than other factors which generally increase this risk—e.g., marrying young.

Key words

interracial, marriage, intermarriage, divorce, interracial interaction

Interracial marriage is an indicator of social distance (Muhsam, 1990), reflecting the way social interaction is structured in a society and allowing us to look at the current state of race relations (Tinker, 1982; Kalmijn, 1993). Using census data, Stevens and Tyler (1998) estimate that the percentage of all marriages which were interracial (not including Hispanics as a separate category) increased from 0.4 percent in 1960 to 2.9 percent in 1990. Between 1980 and 1990, interracial marriage became more prevalent among all gender, educational and racial groups, but especially among the more educated (Qian, 1997).

But while an increase in interracial marriage may move us closer to a multiracial society, there is some concern that these marriages are less stable than marriages where spouses are from the same racial group. There is a small literature which has looked at interracial marriage and marital disruption, and supports the idea that in general, interracial and interethnic marriages are less stable than same race unions.

Using both waves of the NSFH, this paper addresses the following questions: Are interracial marriages less stable than same race unions? What factors help explain the differential stability between same race and interracial marriages?

I use logistic regression to predict the divorce or separation of the couple by Wave 2. After reviewing the literature about interracial marriage and divorce, I look at variables available in the NSFH which help explore whether a lack of connection with family members or a higher level of conflict in the marriage can help explain why they are more likely to disrupt than endogamous couples. I organize the rest of the analysis by introducing characteristics of the couple which predict a higher chance of divorce for interracial couples than endogamous couples into the models, and then adding in characteristics which predict a lower chance of divorce for

interracial couples.

If the increase in interracial marriage continues, it will become more important to examine the marital stability of these unions. If divorces are more common among interracial marriages, the factors explaining these differences need to be examined. Consequences for the children who are involved are also important, since divorce affects women and children more adversely than men (Duncan & Hoffman, 1985; Hoffman & Duncan, 1988; Holden & Smock, 1991; Smock, 1993; Peterson, 1996; Bianchi, Subaiya, & Kahn, 1999). Divorce leaves more children in single parent households, which increases the risk of negative outcomes for children (McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994).

INTERRACIAL MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

The literature exploring the relative stability of interracial and interethnic marriages and endogamous marriages provides conflicting evidence. There has been more speculation than actual research on the topic, partly due to a lack of good nationally representative data which would allow comparisons of divorce rates for interracial and same race marriages. Census data, virtually the only data source large enough to obtain decent sample sizes for the various interracial combinations, have no direct measures of marital dissolution, and provide only a snapshot of current marriages. Vital statistics data--marriage and divorce records--are not comparable for the entire United States since reporting and collection varies by state. Race data is no longer collected in vital statistics data in many states, some of them states where we might expect a higher prevalence of interracial marriage, e.g. California (Monahan, 1966; 1970; 1971a; 1971b; 1976a). Longitudinal data on interracial couples have been virtually non-existent, due to the relatively rare nature of interracial marriage.

[Table 1 about here]

Existing studies have usually found that divorce rates for various interracial combinations fall between those for the endogamous marriages of the two race groups involved in the particular combination (Monahan, 1966; Monahan, 1970; Ho & Johnson, 1990; Jones, 1996). Monahan appears to be the main proponent of the idea that interracial marriages are only slightly less stable than same race unions; that the difference has decreased over time in Hawaii (Monahan, 1966; Ho & Johnson, 1990); and that in some cases interracial unions are more stable (Monahan, 1971b). Although Schmitt (1969) does not discuss this topic, his study shows that the number of divorces granted during 1964-1966 per 100 marriages contracted during 1961-1963 in Hawaii was quite similar for same race and interracial couples--22.5 and 22.1 respectively. As he notes, divorce ratios differed more by age gap between the spouses than by racial differences. But, methodological concerns about these studies include the fact that the samples were small and unrepresentative (Spickard, 1989:328).

The bulk of the literature supports the other position--that intermarriages are less stable than intramarriages. Three studies (Schmitt, 1969; Monahan, 1970; Ho & Johnson, 1990) found that in some cases mixed marriages had a lower divorce ratio than same race marriages, while eight studies found that mixed marriages had a higher risk of divorce, (Cheng & Yamamura, 1957; Monahan, 1966; Monahan, 1970; Monahan, 1971b; Heer, 1974; Schwertfeger, 1982; Rankin & Maneker, 1988; Ho & Johnson, 1990).

With respect to the studies which show mixed marriages as more stable than same race marriages, Schmitt (1969) does not say whether the small difference he finds between the two types of couples is significant. Monahan (1970) finds that only one interracial combination of

those which he considers is more stable than endogamous marriages, that being black husband white wife couples. Ho and Johnson's (1990) results reverse depending on the group of marriages used as the base. They use 1986-1988 Hawaiian marriage and divorce data and find that interethnic marriages are more stable when considering resident marriages as the base, but that same race marriages are more stable when considering all marriages as the base. This is due to the fact that a relatively large proportion of marriages contracted in Hawaii are to nonresident endogamous Caucasians who are likely to divorce elsewhere if they divorce. Besides methodological concerns, since intermarriage in Hawaii has a very different history and context than intermarriage in the continental US, it would be ill advised to conclude based on these two studies that mixed marriages are more stable than endogamous marriages.

The remaining studies which have compared the stability of endogamous and mixed marriages use measures other than the divorce ratio to estimate the difference in stability between interracial and same race marriages. These measures include a longitudinal study which considered the percent of marriages at a given time point which ended in divorce by a second point in time (Schwertfeger, 1982), median years of marital duration (Rankin & Maneker, 1988), and a comparison of the number of marriages of particular racial combinations at two points in time (Heer, 1974). All three of these studies found intermarriages to be less stable than same race marriages.

The evidence from the bulk of the literature is that mixed marriages tend to be less stable, although this clearly varies by the particular interracial combination. The higher rates of divorce for mixed marriages hold across several different types of samples, and across studies which use

several different methods of estimating stability.

There are at least three reasons it is time for an in-depth look at interracial marriage and marital stability. The first reason is that most of the studies in the area were done in the late 1960s and 1970s (Monahan, 1970; Heer, 1974; Schwertfeger, 1982; Jones, 1996). Much has happened in terms of race relations in the US in the intervening years. The second reason is that the studies in this area provide inconclusive findings at best. This is due in part to the third reason, which is that a lack of good data forced researchers to use less than ideal methods and samples which are small or confined to particular geographic areas, e.g. Hawaii (Monahan, 1966; 1970; 1971b; Ho & Johnson, 1990).

This paper uses recent nationally representative data to study marital disruption among intermarried couples. The methods used in this paper—logistic regression, are more appropriate for looking at marital stability than using the divorce ratio based on marriage records. Since race relations are at the forefront of major issues facing the US today, we need better information about the interaction of racial groups within marriages and families.

Family Opposition and Higher Levels of Conflict

Two possible explanations for the gap between disruption rates for interracial and endogamous couples are that interracial couples may lack social support from family members, and that interracial couples may have a higher level of conflict in their marriages since they are likely to be dissimilar culturally. In this section, I discuss each of these explanations and conclude with two hypotheses which I test using NSFH data.

Family objections to the marriage is one, if not the major, obstacle facing interracial

couples (Sung, 1990; Rinaldo, 1996). Family and friends may affect the success of the relationship by providing support, e.g. by commenting that the couple is a good match or inviting them to social functions as a couple, or telling them they can work through any difficulties. They may also damage a relationship by facilitating spouses' dissatisfaction with their marriage. In long lasting marriages, outside support for the relationship was found to be associated with marital success (Bryant & Conger, 1999). Conversely, we might assume that if the couple's support network explicitly opposes the relationship, this may increase the risk of divorce.

If social norms and protocols are less developed for interracial couples, this may translate into a lack of support for these relationships. It is all too easy to imagine extended family members who may express their disapproval of the match or otherwise make an in-law unwelcome. Cherlin (1978) finds that similar problems exist for remarried couples. A recent study found that mothers who divorced had fewer ties to their community and poorer relationships with their parents than those who remained married, supporting the idea that a lack of community and family support is associated with a higher risk of divorce (Hanson, McLanahan, & Thomson, 1998).

Studies which have interviewed black-white couples have found that at least some members of the white partner's family usually opposed the match (Rosenblatt, Karis & Powell, 1995:65), but that over time, most family members who were initially opposed reconciled with the couple. The concerns raised by white family members included concerns about disapproval from several sources--society, the community and other family members--toward both the couple and the white family members who opposed the match. Family members also voiced fears for the safety of the couple, concerns about problems their children would have, and fears that the

white spouse would be worse off financially for entering the relationship. The authors also discuss the possibility that much of the opposition from white family members was related to their unwillingness to claim a black person as a member of their family.

Other studies have found that black families are generally more accepting of interracial marriages (Rosenblatt, Karis, & Powell 1995:101). The authors offer several reasons there may be less opposition in black families. First, mothers were the key person whose opinion mattered to the couple, while fathers often played a significant role in white family opposition. Fathers were more often strongly opposed to interracial matches than mothers. Second, there were fewer family members whose opinion mattered to the couple than in white families, so there were simply fewer people to oppose the match. Third, the sample more often involved black men than black women, and men in most groups are allowed more freedom than women to make choices about partners. Fourth, black families may have less stringent rules about who counts as family, so that it is less difficult to accept someone who is viewed as different as a family member (Rosenblatt, Karis, & Powell, 1995).

In addition to family objections, a second factor which may help explain the persistent gap in disruption rates between endogamous and interracial couples is that there may be higher levels of conflict in these marriages, arising from dissimilarity in cultural backgrounds. Less commonality between partners is assumed to destabilize the relationship by making it more difficult for them to communicate clearly with each other and to negotiate satisfactory agreements. Measures of marital conflict such as resorting to physical violence (Sayer & Bianchi, Forthcoming), behavioral problems such as spending money foolishly, irritating habits, jealousy and infidelity (Amato & Rogers, 1997), and the perception of fairness in the division of

labor in the relationship (Webster, Orbuch & House, 1995; Sayer & Bianchi, Forthcoming) have been found to be linked to higher rates of divorce.

Rosenblatt, Karis and Powells' qualitative interviews with black-white couples, who should experience the most extreme opposition, given that blacks experience the greatest social distance from all other racial groups, point to two hypotheses: first, that NSFH respondents in interracial couples will be less connected to their family members and to their communities than those in endogamous couples; second, since they are likely to be less homogamous than endogamous couples, that interracial couples will have a higher level of conflict.

Data

Wave 1 of the NSFH was collected in 1987-88 and is nationally representative of non-institutionalized civilian adults. The total sample was 13,007 adults randomly selected within the household. The survey oversampled black, Mexican and Puerto Rican families, single-parent families, families with stepchildren, cohabiting couples and recently married couples (Sweet, Bumpass & Call, 1988). Wave 2 was conducted in 1992-94, when 10,008 of the original respondents were re-interviewed.

The sample of respondents who were married, spouse present at wave 1 was 5,637, of which 4,588 respondents had wave 2 interviews as well. There were 198 respondents in interracial marriages at wave 1 who had both interviews. Attrition was somewhat higher for respondents in interracial marriages--21 percent (53/251 cases) as compared with 18 percent (951/5238 cases) for respondents who were in same race marriages at wave 1. After dropping cases with non-response on items selected for this study, 3,180 cases remain. All tables and figures use this sample.

Which Marriages are Interracial?

I define an interracial marriage as a marriage in which the spouses are identified as falling into different categories where the choices are: American Indian, Asian, Black, White, Other and Hispanic. Hispanic origin is asked as a separate question from race; I have coded race of the spouses so that Hispanic origin overrides the race reported for that spouse. So the racial categories I use are non-Hispanics of all races, and a Hispanic category which may include persons of any race. The percentage of married, spouse present unions which are interracial in Wave 1 is 3.8 percent. While 10 percent of the same race couples separated or divorced by Wave 2, 24 percent of the interracial couples disrupted.

Connection with Family Members

The NSFH interview did not collect information directly about whether family members opposed the marriage, but there are other measures of the quality of the respondent's relationship with their family which can be used as proxies.

[Table 2 about here.]

A variable used as a proxy for connection to family and social support received is the type of marriage ceremony the respondent reported having. The idea here is that couples who had a religious ceremony have greater support from family since religious ceremonies are usually larger than civil ones, and are often paid for at least partly by the families of the couple. The variable is coded into three categories: couples who had a religious ceremony, or both a civil and a religious ceremony; couples who had only a civil ceremony; and those which reported "no marriage ceremony" or "other." Interracial couples are much more likely to have only a civil ceremony, 31 percent as compared with 17 percent of endogamous couples. I also considered variables

which measured how well respondents got along with their siblings, how often respondents communicated with their parents, and the extent to which respondents participated in community activities. These variables did not help explain differential disruption rates.

To test the second hypothesis about whether interracial couples have higher levels of conflict, I used the set of self-enumerated questions on the NSFH which ask the respondent about the level and nature of conflict in the marriage. The questions asked the respondent to rate how often he or she fought with their spouse in the past year about various issues. A six point Likert scale was used with responses ranging from “never” to “almost every day,” with higher values meaning that the couple fights more often.

I created a scale by taking the mean of four items: how often the couple fights about household tasks, money, time spent together, and sex. Interracial couples fight significantly more often, although the means for the scale show that the values are low for both types of couples: endogamous couples had a value of 1.87 and interracial couples had a value of 2.09. A value of one on the Likert scale for responses is “never” and a value of two is “less than once a month.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale is .75. Respondents in interracial marriages report that their marriage might be in trouble more often than those in endogamous marriages, 29 percent as compared with 21 percent, although the difference is not significant.

Other predictors in the models

Other predictors are organized into two groups, dividing them based on whether we expect the difference between interracial and endogamous couples to result in a higher or lower chance of disruption for interracial couples. Couples who have been married for a shorter time (White, 1990), those who cohabited before marrying (Bennett, Blanc, & Bloom, 1988; Bumpass

& Sweet, 1989; Krishnan, 1998), those who were previously married (Castro Martin & Bumpass, 1989), those who attend religious services less frequently (Glenn & Supancic, 1984; Call & Heaton, 1997; Krishnan, 1998), and those who are childless (Wineberg, 1988) are more likely to divorce. Interracial couples, as compared with endogamous couples, are more often previously married (Tucker & Mitchell-Kernan, 1990; Sung, 1990), are less likely to have grown up in a two-parent family (Bumpass, Castro Martin & Sweet, 1991; Amato, 1996), are more likely to cohabit before marriage, are more often childless (Heer, 1974; Rankin & Maneker, 1988), and are less likely to be religious. I use these variables in the models to control for characteristics which we would expect to result in a higher chance of disruption for interracial couples.

At the same time, some characteristics of interracial couples are associated with a lower chance of divorce. Based on the literature, we expect interracial couples to have proportionately fewer respondents who are black than among endogamous couples, to have a higher level of education (Spickard, 1989; Sung, 1990; Heaton & Albrecht, 1996; Qian, 1997), to be more likely to be foreign born, and to marry at relatively later ages than endogamous couples (Monahan, 1971a; Rankin & Maneker, 1988; Sung, 1990; Tucker & Mitchell-Kernan, 1990). These variables are also included in the models.

I use two other variables in the models as controls. The first is the couple's income, including earnings, and other income such as income investments and interest and dividends for both the respondent and spouse. Some studies have found that interracial couples have a higher income than endogamous couples (Shinagawa & Pang, 1988; Sung, 1990; Heaton & Albrecht, 1996). However, in the NSFH, interracial couples have an average income of almost \$7,000 less than endogamous couples. I log income in the models to minimize the effect of outliers. The

second variable I use as a control is region of the country in which the couple lives at Wave 1. Interracial couples are more likely to live in the West (Heer, 1974; Tucker & Mitchell-Kernan, 1990).

[Table 3 about here.]

Since the NSFH collected data at two time points, we can control for predictors of disruption at Wave 1 and see whether the couple broke up by Wave 2. The first model controls only for whether the couple was interracial or not. (See Table 3.) The second model adds the variables indicating connection with family members and the level of marital conflict. The third model includes variables which we expect to predict higher rates of divorce for interracial couples, and the fourth model has only the variables which we expect to predict lower rates of divorce for interracial couples. The last model includes all of the sets of predictors. The models are weighted using “spweight,” the weight for couple level analysis that weights cases up to the US population of married persons by age, sex, and race, which is divided into white, black, Hispanic and other.

The first model shows the increased risk of disruption that interracial couples face as compared with endogamous couples, in the NSFH. Interracial couples are nearly three times more likely to disrupt than same race couples. Model 2 controls for the variables which are used as proxies for the connection between respondents and their families, and variables which measure the level of conflict in the marriage. After taking these factors into account, the relative odds of disruption associated with being in an interracial couple drops to 2.2 times more likely than for endogamous couples. Couples who had only a civil ceremony were 83 percent more likely to disrupt than couples who had a religious ceremony. More frequent fights were

associated with higher odds of divorce. Respondents who thought their marriage might be in trouble were often correct—the odds of divorce for these couples is over twice that for couples in which the respondent did not report he or she thought the marriage might be in trouble.

In Model 3, after controlling for characteristics which we expect to predict higher rates of divorce for interracial couples, we see that the relative odds of divorce associated with being in an interracial couple are lower than in Model 2: interracial couples are 78 percent more likely to disrupt than endogamous couples. Couples who have been married less than 7 years have odds of divorce which are twice as high as for those married 7 or more years. Couples who lived together before marrying were also more likely to break up. If the couple lives in the Northeast, they are 62 percent as likely to divorce as couples who live in the South. As expected, based on Amato's (1996) work, couples in which both spouses were not with both parents at age 19, and so were more likely to have experienced the divorce of their parents, were 81 percent more likely to disrupt than couples in which both spouses were living with two parents at age 19. Couples in which one spouse was not with both parents at age 19 were 39 percent more likely to divorce than those in which both spouses lived with two parents.

The fourth model controls for factors which we expect to predict a lower chance of divorce for interracial couples. The relative odds of divorce for interracial couples are the same in this model as in Model 1, where only the variable indicating the type of couple is used to predict disruption. In Model 4, interracial couples are 2.7 times as likely to divorce as endogamous couples. The lack of difference in the odds ratio for whether the couple is interracial in the two models may also be due in part to the fact that interracial couples in this sample do not have higher education on average than endogamous couples as we expected based

on the literature, and to the fact that neither the wife's age at marriage or whether the respondent is foreign born are significant predictors of disruption in this model.

Model 5 combines all three sets of predictors in the same model. The relative risk of disruption associated with being in an interracial couple is 1.71 times that for endogamous couples, and is significant only at the $\alpha=.05$ level.

Conclusion

[Figure 1 about here.]

Figure 1 graphs the standardized coefficients in the final model. Being in an interracial marriage is a less important predictor than other characteristics which we have come to take for granted as increasing the risks of divorce—for example early age at marriage or a higher level of conflict. Since we expect that interracial marriages will become increasingly common in the US, it is useful to know that these marriages are not radically different from endogamous marriages in terms of what predicts divorce.

The bivariate analysis points to weaker family connections and a higher level of conflict within interracial marriages. More research needs to be done to explore whether the higher level of conflict in interracial marriages is due mainly to differences between the spouses or to increased stress due to external pressures on the couple. Perhaps qualitative research is the best method to collect data about discrimination and racism which interracial couples experience. It would be helpful to have this type of information from a broader range of couple types, since most of the current work has been done only with white-black couples (Kouri & Lasswell, 1993; Rosenblatt, Karis, & Powell, 1995), although admittedly, we would expect white-black couples to face the strongest opposition. Do white-Hispanic and white-Asian couples, which are far more

common than white-black couples in the US, face similar types of discrimination in obtaining housing, or on the job (Rosenblatt, Karis & Powell, 1995) as do individuals in white-black couples? As interracial marriages become more common, hopefully the differential in stability rates will decrease over time, as did the effect of parental divorce on the stability of the marriages of their children (Wolfinger, 1999).

REFERENCES

- Amato, P. R. (1996). Explaining the Intergenerational Transmission of Divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 628-640.
- Amato, P. R., & Rogers, S. J. (1997). A Longitudinal Study of Marital Problems and Subsequent Divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 612-624.
- Bennett, N. G., Blanc, A. K., & Bloom, D. E. (1988). Commitment and the Modern Union: Assessing the Link Between Premarital Cohabitation and Subsequent Marital Stability. *American Sociological Review*, 53, 127-138.
- Bianchi, S., Subaiya, L. & Kahn, J. (1999). The Gender Gap in the Economic Well-Being of Nonresident Fathers and Custodial Mothers. *Demography*, 36, 195-203.
- Bryant, C. M., & Conger, R. D. (1999). Marital Success and Domains of Social Support in Long-Term Relationships: Does the Influence of Network Members Ever End? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 437-450.
- Bumpass, L., Castro Martin, T., & Sweet, J. (1991). The Impact of Family Background and Early Marital Factors on Marital Disruption. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 22-42.
- Bumpass, L., & Sweet, J. (1989). National estimates of cohabitation: Cohort levels and union stability. *Demography*, 25, 615-625.
- Call, V. R. A., & Heaton, T. B. (1997). Religious Influence on Marital Stability. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 382-392.
- Castro Martin, T., & Bumpass, L. (1989). Recent Trends in Marital Disruption. *Demography*, 26, 37-51.

- Cheng, C.K., & Yamamura, D. S. (1957). Interracial Marriage and Divorce in Hawaii. *Social Forces*, 36, 77-84.
- Cherlin, A. (1978). Remarriage as an Incomplete Institution. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84, 634-650.
- Duncan, G. J., & Hoffman, S. D. (1985). A reconsideration of the economic consequences of marital dissolution. *Demography*, 22, 485-497.
- Glenn, N. D., & Supancic, M. (1984). The Social and Demographic Correlates of Divorce and Separation in the United States: An Update and Reconsideration. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, 563-575.
- Hanson, T. L., McLanahan, S. S., & Thomson, E. (1998). Windows on Divorce: Before and After. *Social Science Research*, 27, 329-349.
- Heaton, T. B., & Albrecht, S.L. (1996). The Changing Pattern of Interracial Marriage. *Social Biology*, 43, 203-217.
- Heer, D. M. (1974). The Prevalence of Black-White Marriage in the United States, 1960 and 1970. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 36, 246-258.
- Ho, F.C. & Johnson, R.C. (1990). Intra-ethnic and Inter-ethnic Marriage and Divorce in Hawaii. *Social Forces*, 37, 44-51.
- Hoffman, S. D., & Duncan, G. J. (1988). What Are the Economic Consequences of Divorce? *Demography*, 25, 641-645.
- Holden, K. C., & Smock, P. (1991). The Economic Costs of Marital Dissolution: Why Do Women Bear a Disproportionate Cost? *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 51-78.
- Jones, F.L. (1996). Convergence and Divergence in Ethnic Divorce Patterns: A Research Note.

- Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 213-218.
- Kalmijn, M. (1993). Trends in Black/White Intermarriage. *Social Forces*, 72, 119-146.
- Kouri, K.M. & Lasswell, M. (1993). Black-White Marriages: Social Change and Intergenerational Mobility. *Marriage and Family Review* 19, 241-255.
- Krishnan, V. (1998). Premarital Cohabitation and Marital Disruption. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 28, 157-170.
- McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing Up With a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Monahan, T.P. (1966). Interracial Marriage and Divorce in the State of Hawaii. *Eugenics Quarterly*, 13, 40-47.
- Monahan, T.P. (1970). Are Interracial Marriages Really Less Stable? *Social Forces*, 48, 461-473.
- Monahan, T.P. (1971a). Interracial Marriage in the US: Some Data on Upstate New York. *International Journal of the Sociology of the Family*, 94-105.
- Monahan, T.P. (1971b). Interracial Marriage and Divorce in Kansas and the Question of Instability of Mixed Marriages. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 2, 107-120.
- Monahan, T.P. (1976). An Overview of Statistics on Interracial Marriage in the United States, with data on its extent from 1963-1970. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 223-231.
- Muhsam, H. (1990). Social Distance and Asymmetry in Intermarriage Patterns. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 21, 307-324.
- Peterson, R. R. (1996). A Re-Evaluation of the Economic Consequences of Divorce. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 528-536.

- Qian, Z. (1997). Breaking the Racial Barriers: Variations in Interracial Marriage Between 1980 and 1990. *Demography*, 34, 263-276.
- Rankin, R. P., & Maneker, J. S. (1988). Correlates of Marital Duration and Black-White Intermarriage in California. *Journal of Divorce*, 11, 51-67.
- Rinaldo, P. (1996). *Marrying the Natives: love and interracial marriage*. New York: DorPete Press.
- Rosenblatt, P. C., Karis, T. A., & Powell, R. D. (1995). *Multiracial Couples: Black and White Voices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sayer, L., & Bianchi, S. (2000). Women's Economic Independence and the Probability of Divorce: A Review and Re-examination. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 906-943.
- Schmitt, R. C. (1969). Age and Race Differences in Divorce in Hawaii. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 28, 48-50.
- Schwertfeger, M. M. (1982). Interethnic marriage and divorce in Hawaii: A panel study of 1968 first marriages. *Marriage and Family Review*, 5, 49-59.
- Shinagawa, L. H., & Pang, G. Y. (1988). Intraethnic, Interethnic and Interracial Marriages Among Asian Americans In CA, 1980. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 33, 95-114.
- Smock, P. J. (1993). The Economic Costs of Marital Disruption for Young Women Over the Past Two Decades. *Demography*, 30, 353-371.
- Spickard, P. R. (1989). *Mixed Blood Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stevens, G., & Tyler, M. K. (1998). Ethnic and Racial Intermarriage in the United States: Old and New Regimes. Paper presented at the Population Association of America annual

meeting, April 4, Chicago.

Sung, B. L. (1990). Chinese American Intermarriage. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 21, 337-352.

Sweet, J., Bumpass, L., & Call, V. (1988). The design and content of the National Survey of Families and Households. NSFH Working Paper No. 1, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Tinker, J. N. (1982). Intermarriage and Assimilation in a Plural Society: Japanese-Americans in the United States. *Marriage and Family Review*, 5, 61-74.

Tucker, M. B., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1990). New Trends in Black American Interracial Marriage: The Social Structural Context. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 209-218.

Webster, P. S., Orbuch, T. L., & House, J. S. (1995). Effects of Childhood Family Background on Adult Marital Quality and Perceived Stability. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101, 404-432.

White, L. K. (1990). Determinants of Divorce: A Review of Research in the Eighties. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 904-912.

Wineberg, H. (1988). Duration Between Marriage and First Birth and Marital Stability. *Social Biology*, 35, 91-102.

Wolfinger, N. (1999). Trends in the Intergenerational Transmission of Divorce. *Demography*, 36, 415-420.

Table 1 Compilation of Findings Comparing the Stability of Interracial and Same Race Marriages

Author and Year	Measure	Findings	Time Period and Data
Interracial Marriages More Stable than Same Race Marriages			
Schmitt 1969	divorce ratio	22.5 same race 22.1 mixed	1964-66 divorces 1961-63 marriages Hawaii
Ho and Johnson 1990	divorce ratio	54.0 same race 37.2 mixed, by race of wife 38.7 mixed, by race of husband	1985-87 divorces and resident marriages Hawaii
Interracial Marriages Less Stable than Same Race Marriages			
Cheng and Yamamura 1957	divorce ratio	20.4 same race 29.8 mixed	1952-54 divorces 1945-54 marriages Hawaii
Monahan 1966	divorce ratio	18.8 same race 20.2 mixed	1958-62 divorces 1956-1962 marriages Hawaii
Monahan 1970	divorce ratio	19.4 endog. Whites 39.1 endog. Blacks 35.1 White Husb., Black Wife 16.8 Black Husb., White Wife	1955-67 divorces 1948-54 marriages Iowa
Monahan 1971b	divorce ratio	27 same race 45 mixed	1952-69 divorces 1949-66 marriages Kansas
Heer 1974	compares # 1950-60 marriages with # of same type marriages in 1970 census	22.2 % endogamous black 10.2 % endogamous white 53.3 % white husb.-black wife 36.6 % black husb.-white W	1960 and 1970 marriages US Census and Vital Statistics Data
Schwertfeger 1982	percent divorcing by second data point	13.8 % endogamous 19.2 % mixed	1 st marriages of civilian residents 1968, followup 1976 Hawaii
Rankin and Maneker 1988	median marital duration in years	5.4 years endogamous white 5.1 years endogamous black 6.5 years endogamous other 2.9 years white-black 4.7 years white-other 5.0 years black-other	1977 divorces, California
Ho and Johnson 1990	divorce ratio	24.6 same race 33 mixed, by race of wife 35.1 by husband's race	1985-87 divorces and all marriages, Hawaii

Table 2 Means for Characteristics of Couples and the Relationship to Disruption, NSFH

	Interracial Couples	Same Race Couples	Difference
Social Connection			
Had only a civil wedding ceremony	.31 (.041)	.17 (.007)	**
Had a religious wedding ceremony	omitted	omitted	
Had no wedding ceremony (or other)	.01 (.010)	.004 (.001)	
Level of Conflict			
Fights Scale	2.09 (.077)	1.87 (.015)	**
Respondents thought marriage in trouble	.29 (.040)	.21 (.007)	
Characteristics that Predict Higher Chance of Divorce for Interracial Couples			
Married Less than 7 years	.46 (.044)	.26 (.008)	***
Married 7 years or more	omitted	omitted	
Premarital Cohabitation	.46 (.044)	.20 (.007)	***
Higher Order Marriage	.37 (.042)	.26 (.008)	
Husband's Religious Service Attendance	.24 (.038)	.37 (.009)	**
Childless	.31 (.041)	.23 (.008)	
Neither Spouse Experienced Parental Divorce	omitted	omitted	
One Spouse Experienced Parental Divorce	.42 (.044)	.32 (.009)	*
Both Spouses Experienced Parental Divorce	.09 (.025)	.05 (.004)	
Couple's Income, Logged	10.28 (.069)	10.43 (.016)	*
South	omitted	omitted	
West	.36 (.042)	.19 (.007)	***
Northeast	.09 (.026)	.19 (.007)	*
North Central	.17 (.033)	.28 (.008)	**
Characteristics that Predict Lower Chance of Divorce for Interracial Couples			
Black	.08 (.024)	.06 (.004)	
Education	12.4 (.244)	13.2 (.047)	**
Wife Less than age 22.5 at marriage	.47 (.044)	.54 (.009)	
Foreign Born	.20 (.035)	.06 (.004)	***
N (unweighted)	152	3,028	

Source: NSFH Wave 1, weighted. *= $p < .05$ **= $p < .01$ ***= $p < .001$
Standard errors appear in parentheses after the means.

Table 3 Logistic Regression Models Predicting Disruption by Wave 2, NSFH

Odds Ratio	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Interracial	2.72***	2.20***	1.78*	2.71***	1.71*
Social Connection and Level of Conflict					
Had only a civil wedding ceremony	---	1.83***	---	---	1.40*
Had no ceremony or "other"	---	2.08	---	---	1.52
Had a religious wedding ceremony	---	omitted	---	---	omitted
Fights scale	---	1.48***	---	---	1.43***
Resp. thought marriage in trouble	---	2.22***	---	---	2.01***
Characteristics that Predict Higher Chance of Divorce for Interracial Couples					
Marital Duration < 7 years	---	---	2.02***	---	1.09***
Premarital Cohabitation	---	---	1.58**	---	1.37*
Higher Order Marriage	---	---	1.04	---	1.20
Husband's Religious Service Attendance	---	---	.69**	---	.82
Childless	---	---	1.22	---	1.52**
Neither Spouse Experienced Parental Divorce	---	---	omitted	---	omitted
One Spouse Experienced Parental Divorce	---	---	1.39**	---	1.22
Both Spouses Experienced Parental Divorce	---	---	1.81**	---	1.61*
Couple's Income, Logged	---	---	.87*	---	.95
South	---	---	omitted	---	omitted
West	---	---	1.00	---	1.08
Northeast	---	---	.62*	---	.70
North Central	---	---	.81	---	.87
Characteristics that Predict Lower Chance of Divorce for Interracial Couples					
Respondent Black	---	---	---	1.88**	1.58*
Average Education	---	---	---	.95	.97
Wife Less than age 22.5 at marriage	---	---	---	.87	1.39*
Respondent Foreign Born	---	---	---	.68	.77
-2 Log Likelihood	2,156	2,023	2,019	2,139	1,922
N=	3,180	3,180	3,180	3,180	3,180

Note: Dependent variable is whether the couple separated or divorced by Wave 2. Weighted.

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

Figure 1.
NSFH Model 5 Standardized Coefficients

