



Working Paper No. 376

Mexicans Now, Italians Then: Intermarriage Patterns

by

[Joel Perlmann](#)

The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College

perlmann@levy.org

April 2003

A dominant concern regarding the contemporary immigration to the United States involves the children, and later descendants, of the immigrants: will they manage to improve upon the conditions of their parents, and repeat the pattern of earlier waves of immigration, namely a slow but steady ascent over several generations. Discussion of the past most usefully concerns the last great wave of immigration, roughly 1890-1920 during which southern, central and eastern Europeans from ethnic stocks that had been little known in the United States before that time, immigrated to a modern, industrial, society in great number. Today there is little difference in socioeconomic position between the descendants of that immigration and the descendants of much earlier arrivals to the United States (Lieberson and Waters 1988). Concern about the offspring of today's immigrants has been expressed most influentially in the theory of segmented assimilation suggested by A. Portes and his colleagues (Portes and Zhou 1993, Portes and Rumbaut 1996). They expect that the offspring of middle-class immigrants will probably assimilate fairly easily, but they warn of the possibility that the children of immigrants entering American society at the bottom will have more trouble than did the children of immigrants who entered at the bottom in past eras. Today's offspring will have more trouble because 1) they are non-white and American society is a long way from ignoring such differences; 2) the nature of the economy has changed so that industrial-economy jobs requiring minimal skill (but still an improvement over the parents' jobs) do not exist in great number as they did in the past; 3) extended education (necessary for today's better jobs) is out of the reach of immigrant families that enter at the bottom; and finally 4) an alienated, inner-city, non-white, youth culture will appeal to these new lower-class second-generation youth who encounter blocked mobility.

I and my colleague, Roger Waldinger have questioned this formulation of segmented assimilation noting 1) that race divisions are socially constructed and tended to work against the immigrant stocks of 1890-1920 too; 2) that low-skill work is not as scarce as claimed; 3) educational attainment may be adequate for notable upward mobility; 4) concerns about youth

culture are hardly new to today's inner city minorities and in any case depend on the first three concerns for their force (Perlmann and Waldinger 1996, 1997; Waldinger and Perlmann 1998). In terms of this issue, the Mexican immigration has a special place.

The Mexicans comprise the largest immigrant group by far, and they are the prime example of a migrant group entering American society at the bottom, rather than with high educational credentials and other economic advantages. We have, of course, some evidence on how members of later generations of Mexican Americans fared in the past. But the past is not the present; the earlier history of the Mexican immigration is not the present-day experience. There are some reasons to worry that present-day conditions may actually be harder for immigrant offspring--besides those already noted, the size and long-term nature of the present immigration wave continues to generate competition for those who came earlier. And there are surely reasons to think that some things have changed for the better: first and foremost in terms of the civil rights of Mexican Americans and also the fact that the immigration is no longer as heavily rural and agricultural in destination, nor limited to the Southwest of the country.

One crucial measure of assimilative tendencies, important in its own right and reflective of many other dimensions of social accommodation, is intermarriage. Given the numerical, language, and class characteristics of the Mexican immigration, as well as the proximity of the United States and the home country, one might well expect considerable constraints on outmarriage. The Mexican group may not be as racialized as Asian groups, or as Dominicans, but Mexicans have certainly been subject to racialized discrimination during the course of the past century in this country.

My purpose in this working paper is to describe what can be said about current outmarriage rates, however tentative the current data, given the recency of second generation maturity and marriage. The crucial questions involve the native-born children of the current decades' immigration. The evidence comes from the March files of the Current Population Survey (CPS) covering the years 1998-2001.¹ I focus on relatively young people, born in 1966-80, who are married with a spouse also present in the same household.

PART I: MEXICANS TODAY

Classifying Ethnic Origins of the Young Married People

First and Second Generation Mexican Americans: four groups

We distinguish first of all between two groups of foreign-born Mexicans, separating out those who came to the United States as young children (at under ten years of age--the 1.5 generation) from those who came at older ages. Among the native-born children of Mexican immigrants, we distinguish those who have *two* parents born in Mexico (native born of foreign parentage: NBFP) from those who have only *one* parent born there (native born of mixed parentage: NBMP). The proportion of these "exceptions," the mixed second generation NBMP has varied over the decades (Table 1)--because it is created, in complex ways, from the ebb and flow of Mexican immigration numbers, and the period of immigration is very long. But if it has varied, it has probably always been higher than most scholars realize, and surely higher than one would

suspect from the minimal attention the NBMP have received. Among the young adult group today, the mixed second generation group comprises no less than 40% of all native-born children of a Mexican immigrant.² Nearly all of these NBMP have a second parent who was born in the United States, and some related work with other sources strongly suggests that two-thirds of these, in turn, had Mexican origins, mostly as the children (not more distant descendants) of earlier immigrants. These issues are taken up in Appendix 1.

Mexican ancestry group

Finally, we can also track a group who have some Mexican origins, but whose Mexican forbearers are at least three generations back. These people comprise a very varied group; they may have four grandparents who emigrated from Mexico or (at the other extreme) these people may have only one Mexican ancestor, whose family came in the 16th century to lands that were conquered from Mexico in the mid-19th century. This group is designated "third or later generation Mexican." One might think that we focus on this group to gain a hint of what intermarriage patterns will be in the future, among the later generations of today's Mexican immigration. This line of thinking, however popular, is misguided. The third and later generation descendants of today are the products of a much older immigration and ethnic experience; aside from all the other differences between then and now, the forbearers of the current "third and later generation Mexicans" experienced a history of much greater discrimination than is common today. One would expect, then, that the intermarriage patterns of the third and later generation Mexicans provide a very low minimum rate of intermarriage in judging what to expect of the later-generation descendants of the Mexican immigration of our own time. We include this group partly to emphasize the range of generational types, and differences in outcomes, that are included in the grouping "Mexican" defined most broadly.

Non-Mexican groups

We compare each of these Mexican generation groups to four groups of non-Mexicans: 1) native-born non-Hispanic whites of native parentage, 2) native-born non-Hispanic blacks of native parentage, and 3) other Hispanic immigrants (i.e.: non-Mexicans) and 4) children of at least one other Hispanic immigrant. We are not interested here in studying the intermarriage patterns of these other Hispanics for their own sake. However, when we study the Mexicans, the meaning of outmarriage arises: whether or not such outmarriage includes a marriage to a person of non-Mexican but Hispanic origin. One might argue that this subtlety is simply a matter of definition and we should "get on with it"; after all, when a Pole marries another Slav, when a Dane marries another Scandinavian similar problems arise. True enough; the point here is not that the problem is distinct, but rather that there is considerable interest in this particular form of the problem, because it sheds light on the importance of pan-Hispanic behavior.

Another form of ambiguity also arises in connection with the definition of inmarriage; as we have just seen, two categories of people with Mexican roots also may well have non-Mexican roots: the mixed second generation members, and the third and later generation members. When a first or second generation person having only Mexican roots marries someone who is only part Mexican--hardly a rare occurrence--do we call that inmarriage or outmarriage? There is no simple "right answer" to this question; the point is to examine the patterns and their prevalence.³

Sample Size and Statistical Inference with CPS Files

The unweighted CPS samples of 2nd generation Mexicans include a mere 171 men and 247 women. And the great disparity in these unweighted sample sizes reflects a further complication: the complex sampling design of the CPS samples, that make it difficult to determine a meaningful basis for statistical inference. We would suggest, very roughly, that the 95% confidence interval around a proportion of 20% calculated on a sample of 170 would be about +/- 7 percentage points. This is, of course, only an approximate guide; for the basis of this estimation, see Appendix 2.

On the other hand, we have six closely related samples--the men and women in the 1.5, 2.0 and 2.5 generation samples. We would expect that outmarriage would grow more common across these samples from the 1.5 to the 2.5 samples, for both men and women, and we will not be surprised if women tend to have lower outmarriage rates than men whom we might expect to be less protected from mingling beyond the bounds of the ethnic community. Thus outmarriage rates should vary in predictable ways among these six groups if sampling error is not too great. All six have a connection through at least one parent to the current generation of adult immigrants of middle age, and in the case of the 1.5 and 2.0 generations, both parents are part of this generation of Mexican immigrants. By contrast, the patterns of the 3rd-and-later generation Mexican Americans, are the product of more distant historical dynamics whose combined effects (of generational standing and historical conditions in the earlier generations), bear neither a theoretically hypothesized nor a particularly meaningful empirical relation to the patterns of the 1.5, NBFP and NBMP Mexican American groups. Rather, their experiences are included for the sake of completeness.

Mexican American Marriage Patterns Today

About a quarter of second-generation Mexican men and women have a spouse who is likely to be only part Mexican (Table 2). Relatively few marriages, by contrast, are to a non-Mexican Hispanic. Treating these latter marriages as in- or as outmarriage for Mexicans, changes the Mexican intermarriage rate by only 2% for men and 3% for women. In studying the big picture, then, pan-Hispanic marriage does not matter much for the Mexican pattern. It may well come to matter more, for example as ever-larger numbers of Mexican immigrants come directly, or soon after entry, to regions other than the Southwest; and of course, it may matter more for outmarriage patterns among other Hispanics than it does among Mexicans, by far the largest Hispanic group.

The crucial group on which to focus, if we wish to understand Mexican outmarriage in the context of the immigration experience, is the "true" second-generation, the U.S.-born children of two Mexican-born parents. Note that the groups we exclude with this focus, but that would fall under the rubric "Hispanic," are vastly more numerous today than those on whom we focus: those born in Mexico (whether first, or 1.5 generation), those American-born with only 1 Mexican-born parent, those of the "third or later" generations of Mexican ancestry, and all non-Mexican Hispanics.

We begin by considering the strictest definition of outmarriage--excluding from outmarriage a union of a "true" second-generation Mexican with any of the other Mexican or Hispanic categories just mentioned. By this definition, second-generation outmarriage is decidedly a minority phenomenon today: 18-20% of the men and only 8-11% of the women choosing spouses that meet the definition of outmarriage. However, the figures are much larger (45% and 27%) when we include members of the 3.1 and 2.5 generations, who are surely more assimilated, and also include many spouses of mixed immigrant origins. As expected, the proportions outmarrying in the 1.5 generation are notably lower, and in the 2.5 generation notably higher than in the true second generation.

What are we to conclude from the relatively low rate of outmarriage observed when the phenomenon is defined most strictly? First of all, we can ask about the implications of these rates for the ethnic origins of the next generation: how many children of the "true" second generation Mexican Americans will be raised in mixed-origin homes? Overall, the outmarriage rate for men and women is about 15.5% (11% for women and 20% for men). Consider then a group of 10,000 "true" second-generation Mexicans; only 1550 outmarry, while 8450 inmarry. But whereas those who inmarry form 4225 couples, those who outmarry form 1550 couples (because the former draw a spouse from within the group, while the latter draw their spouses from outside the group). Thus the proportion of mixed origin *couples* that form will always be larger than the rate at which *individuals* chose to outmarry. In this case the outmarriage rate for individuals is 15.5% while the mixed origin couples amount to $1,550/(1,550 + 4,225)$ --or 26.8%. Finally, and crucially, the ethnic origins of the next generation result from the rate at which couples form, not the rate at which individuals outmarry.⁴ While less than a sixth of individuals outmarry, more than a quarter of their offspring will be of mixed origin.

We may still ask, how large is the rate of "more than a quarter." One answer is that the figures cited here are in fact smaller than those often cited for second generation outmarriage, because we have excluded from "the American born children of Mexican immigrants" those who had only one Mexican immigrant parent (a group nearly as large as those whom we include); and among this excluded group outmarriage rates are more than twice as high as for the "true" second generation members.

Formation of a "non-white underclass"?

The segmented assimilation hypothesis regarding the contemporary second generation predicts that race class and culture will come together to channel many second generation members into a non-white "underclass" One dimension of such channeling might reasonably be expected to include intermarriage. And, as in the case of other features of the segmentation hypothesis, and of contemporary intermarriage, the case of the second generation Mexican Americans is pivotal, given their size and class origins. Do intermarriage patterns suggest the emergence of a unified non-white "underclass"? One way to operationalize the question is to compare the odds that native-born whites of native parentage (NWNP) will marry second-generation Mexican Americans (Mexican NBFP) to the odds that native-born blacks of native parentage (NBkNP) will marry second-generation Mexican Americans (Mexican NBFP). Our matrix of ethnic marriage choices would seem to be ideal for calculating the sorts of odds ratios just

described--see for example the Appendix Tables A and B. However, it is in fact far from ideal: the very low probabilities of these forms of outmarriage coupled with the small sample sizes coupled (see Table A for both) makes it impossible to find meaningful and statistically significant trends. For example, in Table B, the proportions of both NWNP and NBlkNP marrying Mexican NBFP round off to zero. On this point, then, we can only say there is no trend so strong as to stand out clearly with the small samples available. Appendix A3 provides more detail on appropriate measures as well as empirical evidence.

PART II. A POINT OF REFERENCE: ITALIANS THEN

Another way to evaluate the magnitude of outmarriage among "true" second-generation Mexicans today involves a comparison to the historical experience of other groups in the past. We consider here the experience of the Italians, the largest immigrant group to arrive during the last great wave of immigration, an immigration concentrated especially between the years 1900 and 1914. Like the Mexicans today, the Italians came as labor migrants, with low skill levels relative to the native-born population. Unlike the Mexican immigration of today, however, that immigration was tightly compressed in a narrow range of years, whereas some Mexicans had settled in the southwest before the British arrived in the east, and more had immigrated over many decades, especially since 1910; thus intermarriage patterns may differ in complex ways related to this difference, because the Mexican second generation of our own time may find a spouse of "third and later generation" Mexican origin, whereas comparable choices were not available to the Italian second generation. Also, the Italian immigration ended abruptly due to immigration restriction (followed by depression and war). So many second-generation Italians were choosing their spouse after immigration from Italy had slowed to a trickle. How this demographic pattern affected the marriage market remains to be worked out.⁵ Our examination of Italian intermarriage patterns rests on the public use samples of the 1920 and 1960 United States Censuses.⁶ For our purposes, these sources provide information quite comparable to the information on the Mexicans of our own time that we have drawn from the CPS.⁷ Also, for the sake of simplicity, our attention here is limited to behavior of the second-generation Italian women: We study first the birth cohort from 1886-1900, and observe their outmarriage rates in 1920 and in 1960 (limiting attention, in the later year, to those in their first marriage).

The outmarriage rates are not identical in the two samples (Table 3), 12% in the first and 17% in the second, but close enough for results from two national samples spaced forty years apart. Recall that using the strictest definitions, Mexican second-generation women outmarry at a rate of some 11% today. Thus the 12-17% range for those Italian women may be slightly higher, but is roughly in the same range--but the prevalence of Italians in the American population was far smaller than than the proportion of Mexicans in the American population today. In the 1998-2001 CPS files, Hispanics comprised 18% of the sampled husbands in the young birth cohort we are studying; in 1920, Italians comprised fewer than 3% of the sampled husbands. These numbers imply that, all else being equal, it was some six times as hard to limit one's choice of a spouse to an Italian at that time than it is to limit one's choice of a spouse to a Mexican today. The fact that the second-generation Italian women then nevertheless *did* limit their choice to their own kind roughly as often as second-generation Mexican women do today

strongly suggests that the constraints *other* than group size that operated against outmarriage were actually greater for Italian women living at that time than are the comparable constraints operating for Mexican women today. At any rate, we should conclude that such constraints are surely *not* appreciably larger today than they were at that time.

Moreover, outmarriage for second-generation Italian women increased sharply over time. The rates remained pretty constant until the birth cohort of 1906-10 --women who turned twenty on the eve of the Depression. But thereafter, outmarriage for the "true" second-generation Italian women increased markedly, so that for the cohort of women who reached their twentieth birthday during World War II, outmarriage stood at 41%. This rise in outmarriage among the later birth cohorts of Italians who are of the same generational status as the earlier cohorts--is probably *not* explained by some massive shift in American tolerance to diversity generally. However a tolerance for Italians in particular may have increased as the group became more familiar to other Americans; also Italians who arrived later may have been somewhat more rapidly upwardly mobile, partly because of the connections to earlier arrivals. And finally, there may have been more residential change during depression and war.

How much of the observed rapid rise in the Italian outmarriage rate over the decades was due to the cessation of large-scale immigration, depression and war, or other factors that are not common to the Mexican second generation of our own era we cannot say. But it is at least noteworthy first that the Mexican constraints on outmarriage look smaller, or at least no larger, than those facing Italians in an earlier period, and that from constraints of that magnitude Italian second-generation outmarriage rates shot up during the course of a generation.⁸

This paper has not considered at all one big difference between the two periods of immigration: the second one occurs during a time when marriage itself is less prevalent, while cohabitation and childbirth out of wedlock are more prevalent. Nevertheless, for these changes to radically affect our major conclusion, one would have to believe first that the unions outside of marriage should be regarded as a measure of assimilative tendencies that is as important as marriage; and second one would have to believe that among the Mexican American second generation, unions outside of marriage involve a non-Mexican-origin partner far *less* frequently than do marriages. This second point in particular seems improbable. On the basis of the marriage data, in any case, current-day Mexican outmarriage does not appear to be distinctly higher than that of a European immigrant and ethnic group in the past--a group whose members were then "racialized" and are now routinely considered, European Americans and white. In this sense, Mexican intermarriage behavior observed thus far falls within recognized bounds of a trajectory that leads to full union with the mainstream.

APPENDICES

A1. The Mixed Second Generation (NBMP): A Closer Look

Since we are especially interested in the second generation, among whom the NBMP are often routinely counted, we can profitably pause here to consider the ethnic origins of the NBMP more closely--specifically, the identity of that parent who was not a Mexican immigrant. We

can obtain some additional information directly from our dataset--which includes, it will be recalled, the young married people in the 1998-2001 CPS files. Specifically, we can learn whether the *non-Mexican-born* parent of our NBMP sample member was an immigrant from some other country, or was born in the United States; some 95% were in fact born in the United States.⁹

Still, we would like to know more about the ethnic origins of the native-born parent of an NBMP sample member. After all, it makes a difference to our understanding of this group if the parent was a) second-generation Mexican American, or b) *n* th generation Mexican American (with *n* ≥ 3) or c) of some other ethnic origin altogether: German, for example.¹⁰ But in the sample data, in all three of these cases, the young married people would simply report the relevant parent to be native-born. Nevertheless, we can learn something more, by resort to other CPS data from an earlier year.

A well-known CPS dataset from November, 1979 provides information on birthplace, parental birthplaces, and ancestry. Nearly all our young married people from ca. 2000 would have been born by 1979, and would have been living, for the most part, with their parents. We can identify NBMP children in the 1979 dataset who are members of the same birth cohorts as our young married people from ca. 2000; we then look at the parents of those children--who are respondents to the 1979 CPS questionnaire, and therefore report their own and their parents' birthplaces (the birthplaces of the *grand* parents of the sampled children).¹¹

This exercise with the 1979 CPS in fact yields a clear-cut result, notwithstanding a relatively small number of cases (unweighted *n*=193).¹² Two thirds of the relevant NBMP children had some Mexican origins on *both* sides of the family. More specifically, in 42% of the cases, the non-Mexican-born parent of such a child was a second generation Mexican American (at least one of the child's two *grand* parents on this side of the family having been born in Mexico); and in another 26% of the cases, the non-Mexican-born parent of such a child was a third-or-later generation Mexican American (i.e.: native born of native parentage reporting Mexican ancestry). Moreover, virtually none of these 26% with Mexican ancestry reported any *non-* Mexican ancestry.

We can now return to our sample of young married people from ca. 2000; in the light of the foregoing, we can assume that some two thirds of the mixed second-generation (NBMP) members of that sample actually had Mexican origins on both sides of the family (and in nearly all cases, only Mexican origins)--notwithstanding the fact that these Mexican origins are *explicitly* reported for only on one side of the family. Consequently, what crucially distinguishes our two second-generation groups (NBFP and NBMP) is a matter of generational standing: the NBFP are second generation on both sides of the family, whereas the NBMP are second generation on only one side of the family. On the other side of the family two-thirds of those NBMP individuals have some connection to Mexico through a more-distant ancestor.

We can assume that the further the distance from immigration, the greater the likelihood of intermarriage among our young married people from ca. 2000. And we can now say that the

strongest reason for expecting the NBMP to have a greater likelihood of outmarriage than the NBFP is the generational difference between the groups, not a mixed vs. unmixed ethnic legacy (a mixed ethnic legacy being characteristic of only a third of the NBMP group).

A2. Statistical Inference and the CPS Datasets

The CPS documentation provides some examples on standard error calculations (CPS, 1997; under: accuracy of the estimates/standard errors of estimated percentages--formula 2; no pagination). However, at least two sources of uncertainty arise in their application. 1) These examples typically involve calculation of one characteristic in an entire population, or among all blacks or all Hispanics. How the calculation should be modified for subpopulations--young, married, Mexican second-generation women, for example--is often unclear. 2) These examples assume that population estimates are being derived from one CPS file, whereas in this case we use such a file and half of the members of three other files (i.e.: all individuals from 2001 and the individuals rotated into the earlier half of the samples from 1998, 1999, and 2000). Thus the sample n used to estimate a population characteristic is some 2.5 times as large as the examples in the documentation suggest.

In any case, that documentation suggests that the standard error of a proportion can be computed as:

square root of $pq/b/x$, where

pq is the product of the proportion and 1-the proportion,

b is a constant provided in the documentation to account for the complex (non-simple-random) sampling of various populations, and

x is the population size.

We can restate this formula, in terms of other factors that are more useful here: specifically

$x = nw$ where

n = the sample size and

w = the average of the weights for individuals in the sample.

So the standard error of a proportion can be restated:

square root of $(pq/n)(b/w)$ where*

pq/n is the familiar sampling error of a proportion in a random sample and

b/w is the constant provided in the documentation divided by the average weight.

Overall, the average weights are around 1,670 (since 165,000 sample members represent the U.S. population of 275 million). The constant is typically about 2,500 (although larger for some characteristics not discussed here). Thus b/w, the figure by which to inflate the standard error of a proportion if calculated as though the CPS were a random sample, is roughly 1.2 (the square root of 2500/1670).

The text offers as an example the calculation of a 95% confidence interval around a proportion of 20% calculated on a sample of 170. In this example, the standard error of the proportion is:

$$pq/n = .2 * .8 / 170,$$

$$b/w = 1.2$$

and the for statistical significance at the .05 level, we would calculate 1.96 times the standard error.

Thus:

$$\text{square root of } 1.96 * (1.2 * [.2 * .8 / 170]),$$

which is about 6.6 percentage points.

The point here is not to provide a precise computation but to give some sense of magnitudes. Recall in this context the two differences noted at the outset between our calculations and the examples offered in the CPS documentation. Also note that the CPS documentation indicates that significance is defined, in CPS use of its data, as rejection of the null hypothesis at the .1 level. The choice between .1 and the usual .05 typically involves, I suspect, as much difference in the magnitude of the acceptable standard error as the inflation factor b/w.

A3. Formation of a "Non-White Underclass"?

Our operationalization of the question can be expressed in terms of two sets of odds, one for NWNP and one for NBlkNP. The odds are computed as:

$$\textit{number marrying Mexican NBF} / \textit{number marrying other than Mexican NBF};$$

and in each case spouses of other Mexican American generational standing are best omitted altogether (although including them in the denominator in fact has little impact on the results). These odds could be constructed for each sex separately or for both together. The *ratio* of these odds for the two groups, whites and blacks, would provide a measure of the direction of Mexican American outmarriage: towards blacks or whites--a measure independent of black and white group size (see similar measures in Lieberman and Waters 1988).

Group size is not necessarily determinative, of course; black men are roughly 12 times as likely

to marry black as white women in our sample, and black women are some 30 times as likely to marry black as white men. Moreover, whether the segmentation hypothesis really calls for a measure that is independent of group size is worth considering. A measure independent of group size strongly favors the segmentation hypothesis; suppose blacks are found to be moderately more likely to marry Mexican Americans than whites are; since there are so many more whites than blacks, most Mexican Americans will in fact be merging with the white majority, and not with the black minority. In that event, the dominant Mexican American pattern could hardly be described as a flow into a non-white underclass, yet a measure independent of group size would indicate that flow to be the more prevalent one. And if the dominant flow (dependent rather than independent of group size) is towards unions with whites, how large a flow towards union with blacks would constitute support for the segmentation hypothesis? The hypothesis is not formulated in a way that permits answers to such questions.

But we need not fully resolve the point; while measures are available evidence is another matter. As already explained in the text, the very low unweighted sample sizes coupled with the very low propensity of NWNP *or* NBlkNP marrying Mexican NBFP (see Table A for both) makes it impossible to find meaningful and statistically significant trends. In Table B, the proportions of both NWNP and NBlkNP marrying Mexican NBFP round off to zero; and in Table A, using the actual unweighted sample numbers, the resulting odds ratios are not so different from 1.0 (equal odds for NWNP and for NBlkNP) when calculated for men and for women, and the two odds ratios point in opposite directions when calculated for each sex separately.

REFERENCES

- Hicks, Lloyd. 1997. *Annual Demographic Survey March Supplement: Source and Accuracy*. Current Population Survey (CPS). CPS website: www.bls.census.gov/cps/ads/1996/ssrcacc.htm.
- Liebersohn, Stanley, and Mary C. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Perlmann, Joel. 2001. "Toward a Population History of The Second Generation: Birth Cohorts of Southern-, Central-And Eastern-European Origins, 1871-1970." Working Paper No. 333. Annandale-on-Hudson, N.Y.: The Levy Economics Institute.
- Perlmann, Joel and Roger Waldinger. 1996. "The Second Generation and the Children of the Native Born: Comparisons and Refinements." Working Paper No. 174. Annandale-on-Hudson, N.Y.: The Levy Economics Institute.
- _____. 1997. "Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present: A Reconsideration." *International Migration Review* 120 (31).
- Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben Rumbaut. 1996. *Immigrant America* (2nd edition). Berkeley.

Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants among Post-1965 Immigrant Youth." *Annals* 530: 74-96.

Waldinger, Roger and Joel Perlmann. 1998. "Second Generations: Past, Present, Future." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 24 (1).

Table 1. Mexican Americans, by generation and birth cohorts in the CPS, 1998-2001							
birth cohorts	Generation						% mixed origin
	1st	--1.5 --	2nd	-- 2.5 --	3rd +	total	
1926-35	39	0	26	13	22	100	33
1936-45	48	1	11	11	29	100	50
1946-55	49	3	6	9	34	100	60
1956-65	53	5	5	7	30	100	58
1966-75	53	8	9	6	24	100	40

NOTES.
 Source Current Population Survey (CPS) 1998-2001. The earlier half of each March CPS rotation group was included for 1998-2000, and both halves of the March 2001.

In all tables, CPS cases are weighted so that proportions are based on the number of people that each sample member represents in the U.S. population at the time. However, when sample size Ns are shown, they refer to the unweighted number of sample members. This table differs from later ones in covering entire birth cohorts, each decade-long, rather than married people born 1966-80.

For full definitions of the generations, see Table B.

Table 2. Outmarriage: by various definitions (married adults, born 1966-80 in 1998-2001 CPS)

Group				
men	spouse has no Hispanic origins* %	spouse has no Mexican origins* %	spouse may have part or all non-Mexican origins* %	Unweighted sample size N=
Mex g1	6	9	15	1342
Mex g1.5	9	11	29	191
Mex g2	18	20	45	171
Mex g2.5	35	41	73	102
Mex g3+	28	31	89	505
OHis	30	91	95	878
NWNP	96	97	98	7433
NBlkNP	96	98	99	627
Other	94	97	98	1597
Total	83	88	92	12846

women				
Mex g1	4	7	10	1237
Mex g1.5	3	8	8	133
Mex g2	8	11	27	247
Mex g2.5	24	29	54	149
Mex g3+	26	30	84	549
OHis	30	91	94	877
NWNP	97	98	99	7491
NBlkNP	98	100	100	565
Other	94	97	98	1598
Total	83	88	92	12846
<p>Note: The odds that a Mex g2 woman would marry an Hispanic husband were 250 times as great as the odds that a non-Hispanic women would marry an Hispanic husband.</p> <p>For source see Table 1; for ethnic definitions see Table B</p> <p>* No Hispanic origins: NWNP, NBlkNP, Other.</p> <p>No Mexican origins: same plus OHis.</p> <p>part or all non-Mexican origins: same plus Mex g3+ and Mex g2.5.</p>				

Table 3: Outmarriage then: among successive birth cohorts of Italian-American women

birth cohorts	age 20 in	wife's origin	rate of outmarriage %	N=	odds of marrying an Italian husband: Ital g2 vs non-Italian women compared
1886-1900	1906-20	Ital g1	3	1210	763
		Ital g2	17	293	
		Ital g2.5	65	17	
		not Italian	99	37371	
1901-05	1921-25	Ital g1	6	456	327
		Ital g2	22	448	
		Ital g2.5	51	39	
		not Italian	99	23298	

1906-10	1926-30	Ital g1 Ital g2 Ital g2.5 not Italian	9 19 45 99	382 871 78 28601	318
1911-15	1931-35	Ital g1 Ital g2 Ital g2.5 not Italian	16 28 38 98	305 1410 181 34318	133
1916-20	1936-40	Ital g1 Ital g2 Ital g2.5 not Italian	19 37 51 98	135 1677 296 39414	74
1921-25	1941-45	Ital g1 Ital g2 Ital g2.5 not Italian	23 41 55 98	228 1659 469 44228	59
1926-30	1946-50	Ital g1 Ital g2 Ital g2.5 not Italian	25 46 58 97	164 1192 492 43574	44
1931-36	1951-55	Ital g1 Ital g2 Ital g2.5 not Italian	21 55 66 98	129 644 468 40039	35
1936-40	1956-60	Ital g1 Ital g2 Ital g2.5 not Italian	19 69 78 98	75 223 249 32848	23

Notes to Table 3:

Source: IPUMS sample of the 1920 and 1960 censuses(1920: first cohort only).

Generations of Italian-Americans:

- 1 Italian-born;
- 2 U. S.-born of 2 Italian parents
- 2.5 U.S.-born of an Italian and a U. S.- born parent

In the 1960 census public use sample, the specific birthplace of a foreign-born mother was not indicated when the father was foreign-born too. Consequently, a small proportion of those who would have been classified as 2.5 given perfect data are classified as 2.1 (those with an Italian-born father and a foreign-born mother born in a country other than Italy). Similarly, a small proportion of others who would have been classified as 2.5 given perfect data have been classified as non-Italian (those with a non-Italian foreign-born father and a mother born in Italy).

Appendix Table A. Raw numbers in the CPS datasets										
	husbands									
	Mex g1	Mex g1.5	Mex g2	Mex g2.5	Mex g3+	OHis	NWNP	NBlkNP	Other	Total
wives										
Mex g1	975	66	59	19	27	36	30	2	23	1237
Mex 1.5	89	35				6			3	133
Mex g2	100	34	40	14	23	10	19	1	6	247
Mex g2.5	35	15	14	9	30	9	27	3	7	149
Mex g3+	29	19	31	20	266	23	132	6	23	549
OHis	46	5	4	7	14	556	148	23	74	877
NWNP	44	9	15	28	127	145	6567	55	501	7491
NBlkNP	1	2	2		1	13	16	498	32	565
Other	23	6	6	5	17	80	494	39	928	1598
Total	1342	191	171	102	505	878	7433	627	1597	12846
See Table 1 for source, Table B for ethnic definitions.										

Appendix Table B. Outmarriage rates for Mexican and other ethnic groups

Men: wife's ethnic origin (column proportions: read down)

	Mex g1	Mex g1.5	Mex g2	Mex g2.5	Mex g3+	OHis	NWNP	NBlkNP	Other	Total
Mex g1	72	36	32	15	6	4	0	0	1	7
Mex g1.5	6	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Mex g2	8	19	23	13	5	1	0	0	0	1
Mex g2.5	3	9	8	10	6	1	0	0	0	1
Mex g3+	3	9	17	22	52	3	1	1	1	3
OHis	3	2	2	6	3	61	1	2	3	5
NWNP	4	4	10	29	25	18	90	7	33	64
NBlkNP	0	2	2	0	0	3	0	84	2	6
Other	2	3	6	6	3	9	6	5	59	13
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Women: husband's ethnic origin (row proportions: read across)

	Mex g1	Mex g1.5	Mex g2	Mex g2.5	Mex g3+	OHis	NWNP	NBlkNP	Other	Total
Mex g1	79	6	5	1	2	3	2	0	2	100
Mex g1.5	68	25	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	100
Mex g2	41	14	17	6	10	3	5	0	3	100
Mex g2.5	26	11	9	7	18	5	19	2	3	100
Mex g3+	7	3	6	5	49	4	22	1	3	100
OHis	5	1	0	1	2	61	18	3	9	100
NWNP	0	0	0	0	1	1	89	1	7	100
NBlkNP	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	90	5	100
Other	1	0	0	0	1	3	31	3	60	100
Total	7	1	1	1	3	5	63	7	13	100

Notes to Table B.

Source: CPS 1998-2001 (see notes to Table 1). Included are married couples with one or both members born 1966-80.

Ethnic groups: definitions

Mex g1 Mexican-born, came at age 10 or older

Mex g1.5	Mexican-born, came at age 0-9
Mex g2	U. S.-born --- of 2 Mexican-born parents
Mex g2.5	U. S.-born --- of 1 Mexican-born and 1 other parent (of any descent; most U. S.- born)
Mex g3+	U. S.-born of 2 U. S.-born parents; declared Mexican 'origins'
OHis	No Mexican origins; other Hispanic origins indicated by birthplace data or Hispanic 'origins'
(may be of any generation)	
NWNP	Native white of native parentage, no Hispanic origins indicated
NBlkNP	Native black of native parentage, no Hispanic origins indicated
Other	All others; includes non-Hispanic respondents who are 1) racially not black or white, or 2) black or white
	immigrants or children of immigrants.

NOTES

1. We use CPS files linked by Roger Waldinger and his associates at UCLA.
2. First-generation intermarriage rates can also affect these proportions. For a fuller discussion of the mixed nature of second generations (NBFP vs. NBMP) see Perlmann 2001.
3. Note also that for the same reasons (theory, and sample size) we group together as "all others" a) foreign-born blacks, b) foreign-born or second-generation European immigrant groups and c) races other than white or black (including notably Asians and American Indians). However, birthplace, parental birthplaces, or Hispanic origin take precedence in coding: if a Latin American country is listed under any of these variables, the person was included in one of the Mexican or other Hispanic categories described above.
4. It also results from differences in fertility rates across types of couples, but these differences are typically of much smaller magnitude.
5. Another interesting difference between the groups that is often ignored is the fact that the male-to-female sex ratio among the Italian immigrants was much greater than among the Mexican immigrants, creating a greater demand from unattached young immigrant men for second-generation women.
6. The rationale for focusing on these two census samples is partly substantive and partly a matter of sources. Prior to 1920, the relevant samples of second-generation Italian women of marriageable age are small and would add little to the 1920 evidence. The 1930 census is not yet machine readable, and the 1940 and 1950 public use samples include information on parental birthplace only for one person in each household, so they are not well suited for the study of intermarriage. These large datasets are based on random samples of households and so do not involve the special problems of inference that arise in using the CPS files. We use the 1998 IPUMS version of the datasets.
7. Two caveats to this statement must be made. First, in 1960 we cannot distinguish between Italian-born people who came as adults and those who came as children (the first and 1.5 generations respectively). Second, we cannot distinguish in either census year between the "third and later generation" Italians and those native whites of native parentage with no Italian origins. This second limitation is of minor importance because so few Italian immigrants had arrived early enough in American history for a third generation to be of

consequential magnitude when the second generation cohorts we study were looking for marriage partners.

8. One possible source of change is that in later years, the second generation members are increasingly the children of Italians who immigrated to the United States when they themselves were children. This process would put their "second generation" children rather farther along in the generational process of assimilation than the figures here indicate. But such a process would have occurred when immigration declined due to war and restriction (between 1914 and 1919 and after 1922). That is because the high numbers of immigrants in the earlier years brought with them small proportions of children, and these children in turn, when they grew up, comprised high proportions of all Italian-born immigrants in their birth cohort, because war and restriction drove intervened during the years these children grew up and so few adult immigrants of the same age could come as adults. Our table shows that the second generation does decline sharply in magnitude, but the rise in outmarriage occurs prior to that decline; indeed the rise in outmarriage occurs while the size of the cohorts are at their peak, among those Italian women born 1916-25.
9. And among the other 5%, most were not from other countries in Latin America.
10. A fourth possibility, a subcategory of this last group (c), is that the parent is a second or later-generation other (non-Mexican) Hispanic. This is less likely given the recency of immigration from the rest of Latin America, but it is of course possible, especially if we include Puerto Ricans in this group. See below for further distinctions involving first and second generation (as opposed to third or later generation) spouses of other Hispanic origin.
11. Sources of small differences in the populations sampled from 1979 and from ca 2000 include: mortality of children between the dates, remigration of some families to Mexico, and the birth of a few members of the later sample in 1980. Also, the later sample is restricted to those members of the birth cohort who have married.
12. On the issue of statistical inference with the CPS samples, see the text and Appendix A2. The 1979 results are based on families in which one of the child's parents was the household head.