

# Intergenerational transmission of interethnic union formation patterns in Sweden<sup>±</sup>

AYCAN ÇELIKAKSOY\*

## Abstract

This paper explores intergenerational transmission of interethnic union formation behaviour within families. Using register data from Statistics Sweden I find a strong association in union formation patterns between parents and their offspring. This association holds for all levels of individual and parental education and all regions of origin, except for Americans. When countries of origin are categorized according to cultural distance to the Swedish society, the results indicate that parental intermarriage type is important. Decomposing parental intermarriage into detailed categories and separate estimations for each value system indicate that the mechanisms behind intergenerational transmission of union formation patterns vary by value system of the origin country. For individuals with a background from societies that are culturally similar to the Swedish society, all types of parental intermarriage increase their likelihood of intermarriage. However, for individuals from countries that are relatively more distant culturally to the Swedish society, parental intermarriage within the value system does not play a role in the likelihood of their offspring's intermarriage.

**Keywords:** Intermarriage, intra-marriage, social integration, intergenerational transmission of union formation.

## Introduction

As documented and theorized in the literature within various disciplines such as biology, sociology and economics, partnership formation is more likely to take place among individuals with similar characteristics, so called positive assortative matching<sup>1</sup>. Consistent with this literature, the tendency of immigrants to marry within their ethnic group is a common finding<sup>2</sup>.

In addition, recent studies on intergenerational transmissions for ethnic minorities have been discussed within the framework of maintaining group related ethnic, religious or cultural traits over generations, which lead to diverging distinct group characteristics within a country. Some of these studies include analysis of intergenerational transmissions of religion, religiosity and cultural capital, where the majority finds evidence that parental inputs significantly affect individual outcomes (Bisin and Verdier, 2000 and 2001). Positive

---

<sup>±</sup> Comments and suggestions from Eskil Wadensjö, participants at the PAA 2011 meeting and anonymous referees are appreciated. The usual disclaimer applies.

\* Dr Aycan Çelikaksoy is Postdoctoral research fellow at SOFI & SULCIS, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden. E-mail: aycan.celikaksoy@sofi.su.se.

<sup>1</sup> See for e.g. Epstein and Guttman, 1984; Mare, 1991; McPherson *et al.*, 2001; Pencavel, 1998.

<sup>2</sup> See for e.g. Çelikaksoy *et al.*, 2006; Duncan and Trejo, 2007; European Population Committee, 2002; Kalmijn, 1998; Meng and Gregory, 2005.



assortative matching of single individuals on a set of characteristics and transmission of these characteristics from parent to child can be seen as a major source of inequality in society (Smits *et al.*, 1998; Fernandez *et al.*, 2005).

On the other hand, intermarriage can be seen as a source of equality in society. Thus, interethnic marriage is argued to be one of the main indicators of social integration of immigrants (Gordon, 1964). To my knowledge, there are no studies on the issue of intergenerational transmission of ethnic union formation patterns using large scale representative data sets. Thus, if there is such a transmission, consistent with the literature on social integration, intermarriage can be seen as an indicator of social integration not only because it signals blending of different societies at the most personal level but also due to the spill over effects of union formation patterns to the next generations.

To extrapolate on why we might expect intergenerational transmission of interethnic union formation patterns: If ethnicity is one matching dimension, then interethnic individuals might be more likely to intermarry themselves due to potential ethnic compatibility. The children of intermarried couples might have lower ethnic capital than their counterparts with single ethnic parentage, lowering their gains from an ethnic match. Also, potential partners who have a preference to marry within their ethnic background might not consider them as potential spouses. Thus, they are discriminated against by their potential ethnic mates (Chiswick and Houseworth, 2008). In addition, children of mixed parents might have different attitudes towards ethnic others. Most importantly, due to being exposed to an interethnic environment at the most intimate level, a major psychological barrier to forming interethnic unions might be weakened. Thus, we might expect these individuals to be more likely to form partnerships that are interethnic. Clearly, these are only a few of the potential mechanisms and it is not straightforward to identify the different channels that lead to parent child correlations.

Studies on ethnic partnership formation usually utilize individual characteristics and marriage market characteristics to measure preferences and opportunity of contact. Individual characteristics such as country of birth, age, years since migration, ethnic origin and education are generally found to influence preferences, while relative group size and availability of potential spouses within the relevant marriage market are seen as forces structuring the marriage market.

Another important factor that might have an influence on children's attitudes and behaviours is the parental environment that the children are exposed to (Okumura and Usui, 2010). In relation to the contact hypothesis, being exposed to an interethnic parental/family environment might influence the children in terms of ethnic and cultural values, thus affect their tendencies of forming intimate networks with people. First of all, children born into mixed marriages might be relatively more 'inclusive' in their attitudes towards 'ethnic others', have less prejudice, stereotyping and discriminatory attitudes, speak more languages and have more interethnic friends and be drawn to in-

ternational environments, such as schools, extracurricular activities, jobs, etc. Secondly, intermarried parents might be less influential and more indifferent in terms of the ethnic spouse choice decisions of their children. In fact, Goldscheider (2007) shows that parental intermarriage is positively associated with the perceived parental approval of young adults' intermarriage decisions.

In addition, the distance between parental cultures might be an important catalyst due to exposure to a higher degree of intercultural environment at home. Another mechanism is through social integration to the majority society. Having a Swedish parent or a parent from a country that is culturally similar to the Swedish society is expected to be positively correlated to the likelihood of intermarrying.

This paper intends to increase our understanding on interethnic union formation decisions especially with a focus on intergenerational transmissions of this behaviour within families. The paper addresses two main questions: Is there an association between parents' and children's interethnic marriage formation behaviour? And how do analysing parental intermarriage types help us understand some of the mechanisms that underlie the ethnic union formation transmission from parent to child?

## Data

The data used in estimation stems from registered information at Statistics Sweden (SCB) on the entire working age population (16-65 years of age) residing in Sweden in 2005. Included in the data is detailed individual information on personal, demographic and labour market characteristics. In addition, information is available on country of birth and education of the parents. Due to partner identification numbers, it is possible to link all individuals with their partners. Partnership is defined as marriage or cohabitation in a household with joint children, since cohabitation without joint children cannot be observed in the data. Since the majority of parental information is missing for the first generation immigrants the analysis is carried out for the sample of second generation immigrants.

The original sample is restricted to second generation individuals, aged 18-45, who are in a partnership. Individuals with missing information on own, parents' or partners' birth place are dropped from estimation, since this information is necessary to define union types which is the main focus of the paper. Nine per cent of the sample is dropped due to this restriction. This gives a sample of 138,822 individuals with known family backgrounds aged 18-45 and in partnerships during 2005. The definition of own intermarriage is based on the foreign background of the parents of the individual, since the individual is born in Sweden. If there is a common foreign background between the individual's family and the spouse or the spouse's parents then it is defined as intra-marriage (marriage or cohabitation within the same foreign ethnic background), and this dichotomous variable takes the value of 0, otherwise it takes the value of 1 and is defined as intermarriage (interethnic un-

ion). Parental intermarriage is defined by the country of birth of the mother and father, if they are not born in the same country then this variable takes the value of one.

## Results

Table 1 documents raw intermarriage rates by parental marriage type, region of origin and gender. It can be seen that both sons and daughters of intermarried parents have higher intermarriage rates than those who have intra-married parents. This difference is significant for all regions of origin except for North/Central America and Oceania. The largest difference is observed for individuals originating from Asia and the Middle East; around 30 per cent of sons and 27 per cent of daughters with intra-married parents are intermarried as opposed to 85 per cent of sons and 81 per cent of daughters with intermarried parents. Overall, these tables show that the intermarriage rates by parental marriage type are significantly different from each other for each region and gender, except for North American men.

**Table 1:** Own intermarriage by parental marriage type and mother's region of birth for the second generation

Males	Own intermarriage (%)			
	parental intra-marriage	parental inter- marriage	<i>p value</i>	Total
<b>Mother's region of birth</b>				
Nordic & EU15	83	93	0.00	33.455
Other Europe	78	94	0.00	5.758
Nordic/Central America & Oceania	100	99	0.77	431
South America	76	92	0.00	275
Asia/Middle East	30	85	0.00	1.823
Africa	65	93	0.00	171
Total	78	93	0.00	64.501
<b>Females</b>				
Nordic & EU15	83	93	0.00	38.499
Other Europe	72	93	0.00	6.494
Nordic/Central America & Oceania	86	98	0.04	505
South America	70	90	0.00	327
Asia/Middle East	27	81	0.00	2621
Africa	50	94	0.00	264
Total	75	93	0.00	74.321

Table 2 presents the results separately for males and females for regressing own intermarriage on parental intermarriage as well as a set of individual and marriage market characteristics (column 2) and parental characteristics (column 3). The coefficients of main interest are presented in the first row of the Table indicating the strength of the parent-offspring association of interethnic family formation behaviour. For males, having parents who are not born in

the same country increases their sons' and daughters' likelihood of intermarriage by 16.4 and 18.7 percentage points, respectively. When individual and marriage market characteristics are included in the regressions the parental intermarriage effects decrease just slightly to 13.5 and 16 percentage points for sons and daughters, respectively. The figures for sons and daughters are 0.126 and 0.148 when maternal education is also included. These decreases are relatively small which indicates that the association between own and parental intermarriage is quite robust to adding the commonly used predictors of intermarriage into the regressions.

**Table 2:** Dependent variable: Own intermarriage

	Male			Female		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Parental intermarriage	0.164** (0.003)	0.135** (0.003)	0.126** (0.003)	0.187** (0.003)	0.160** (0.003)	0.148** (0.003)
<b>Individual characteristics</b>						
High school		0.030** (0.004)	0.025** (0.004)		0.028** (0.005)	0.024** (0.005)
Short tertiary education		0.046** (0.005)	0.035** (0.005)		0.051** (0.006)	0.039** (0.006)
Long tertiary education		0.058** (0.004)	0.045** (0.004)		0.064** (0.005)	0.050** (0.005)
Ph.D.		0.051** (0.009)	0.035** (0.009)		0.083** (0.010)	0.064** (0.010)
Married		-0.049** (0.002)	-0.049** (0.002)		-0.042** (0.002)	-0.041** (0.002)
Age		0.038** (0.003)	0.038** (0.003)		0.035** (0.002)	0.033** (0.002)
Age squared		-0.045** (0.004)	-0.043** (0.004)		-0.040** (0.003)	-0.037** (0.003)
<b>Marriage market characteristics</b>						
Sex ratio		0.341** (0.033)	0.320** (0.033)		-0.493** (0.031)	-0.469** (0.031)
Relative group size		-0.030** (0.001)	-0.029** (0.001)		-0.012** (0.001)	-0.011** (0.001)
Large city		-0.023** (0.003)	-0.024** (0.003)		-0.029** (0.003)	-0.031** (0.003)
<b>Parental characteristics</b>						
Compulsory 9 yrs.			0.031** (0.005)			0.039** (0.005)
High school (<=2 yrs.)			0.050** (0.004)			0.058** (0.003)
High school (3 yrs.)			0.057** (0.005)			0.077** (0.005)
Short tertiary education			0.062** (0.005)			0.078** (0.004)
Long tertiary education			0.063** (0.004)			0.075** (0.004)
Ph.D.			0.071** (0.014)			0.087** (0.011)
Constant	0.779** (0.003)	-0.272** (0.059)	-0.274** (0.059)	0.754** (0.003)	0.592** (0.052)	0.543** (0.052)
N	64,501	64,501	64,501	74,321	74,321	74,321

Robust standard errors in parentheses  
 \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

Consistent with all the studies on intermarriage, education is positively correlated with the likelihood of intermarriage for both males and females<sup>3</sup>. This might be due to differences in individual preferences related to level of education or due to opportunities related to moving away from home and being in the educational system. Both own and mother's education coefficients are positive and significant and the size of the coefficients increases consistently with higher levels of education, although PhD level coefficients are less precisely estimated. Mother's education, among other factors, might reflect parental preferences for their child's potential spouse's ethnicity.

Marriage is negatively associated with the likelihood of forming an interethnic union, which shows that cohabiting couples are more likely to be in an interethnic relationship. This is a common finding in the literature, which is probably due to the fact that cohabitation is a relatively less traditional union type when compared to marriage. However, the endogeneity problem is not dealt with here. Age has a declining positive effect on the likelihood of intermarriage. To account for differences in opportunity, two marriage market characteristics are included in estimation, sex ratio and relative group size. Sex ratio is defined as the proportion female to male within each country of origin in the estimations on men, and vice versa, the proportion male to female within each country of origin, in estimations on women. Relative group size is defined as the proportion of females (males) from a given country relative to the population of females (males) in Sweden. Sex ratio and relative group size coefficients are negative and significant as expected, except for the sex ratio coefficient for males. This implies that while the size of the ethnic group is negatively associated with the likelihood of interethnic unions for both men and women, the availability of potential spouses within the ethnic group only decreases the likelihood of intermarriage for females. Living in one of the largest cities of Sweden, Stockholm, Goteborg or Malmö decreases the likelihood of intermarriage. This might be due to the majority of individuals with immigrant backgrounds living in these cities, thus increasing the availability of potential spouses from one's own ethnic background.

Table 3 presents the fourth set of regressions including region of origin, measured by mother's birth place as well as the interaction terms of region of origin and parental intermarriage. Controls for individual, marriage market and parental characteristics are also included in these regressions; however they are not reported due to the length of the table. The coefficients of these variables are unchanged except for a slight decrease in the size of the coefficients. Turning to region of origin, it can be seen that individuals from all regions, except for North America, are less likely to be in interethnic unions relative to the reference group (Nordic background). The size of the coefficients is largest for Asia and Middle Eastern origins. However, the interaction

---

<sup>3</sup> Separate estimations for each level of individual and parental education are not reported here, as well as their interaction effects with parental intermarriage. However, parental intermarriage is positive and significant for all educational levels.

terms show that parental intermarriage significantly increases the likelihood of being in an interethnic union for all origins except for Americans. Clearly, the impact of parental intermarriage varies significantly by region of origin and the impact of parental intermarriage is strongest for Asian and Middle Eastern origins. For individuals with an Asian or Middle Eastern background having interethnic parents increases their likelihood of intermarriage by around 40 percentage points. Note that the inclusion of controls for region of origin and the interaction terms decreases the parental intermarriage coefficient sizes almost by 50 per cent.

**Table 3:** Dependent variable: Own intermarriage

	Male (4)	Female (4)
Parental intermarriage	0.070** (0.004)	0.075** (0.003)
<b>Region of origin</b>		
Other Europe	-0.101** (0.008)	-0.131** (0.008)
North America	0.095** (0.018)	-0.007 (0.143)
South America	-0.097* (0.044)	-0.134** (0.040)
Asia/Mid. East	-0.528** (0.014)	-0.531** (0.011)
Africa	-0.240** (0.059)	-0.369** (0.044)
Other Europe*parental int. mar.	0.071** (0.009)	0.100** (0.009)
North America*parental int. mar.	-0.099** (0.018)	-0.009 (0.143)
South America*parental int. mar.	0.045 (0.048)	0.090* (0.045)
Asia/Mid. East*parental int. mar.	0.413** (0.019)	0.391** (0.017)
Africa*parental int. mar.	0.181** (0.064)	0.320** (0.049)
Constant	0.263** (0.056)	1.075** (0.051)
N	64,501	74,321

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

To group countries of origin, two indexes developed by Inglehart (1997) are used to measure values along two dimensions<sup>4</sup>. The first value dimension, 'traditional versus secular/rational' reflects the difference between societies with regard to their emphasis on religion, respect for authority figures, unconditional ties to family, national pride and abortion (Inglehart, 1997; Ingle-

<sup>4</sup> The survey can be found at [www.worldvaluesurvey.org](http://www.worldvaluesurvey.org).

hart and Baker, 2000)<sup>5</sup>. Countries close to the secular/rational pole emphasize the opposite values. The second value dimension ‘survival versus self expression’ reflects the differences among countries with regard to the extent that survival is taken granted for and where subjective well-being, self expression and quality of life are more important. Societies close to the ‘survival’ pole emphasize the priority of economic and physical security over subjective-well being, self-expression and quality of life, as well as little support for gender equality, low levels of political engagement and trust in other people. Societies near the self expression pole emphasize the opposite values.

The list of the country groups according to the World Values Survey can be seen in the Appendix<sup>6</sup>. Sweden is located closest to the ‘rational’ and ‘self expression’ poles and the countries with values closest to Sweden were countries with positive index scores in both dimensions, thus these countries are grouped together. The second group has a positive ‘Traditional-Rational’ index like Sweden but a negative ‘Survival-Self expression’ index, where the opposite is the case for the third group. And finally, the last group is the furthest away from the Swedish society with negative index values for both dimensions.

Now I turn my attention to the type of intermarriage of the parents. The degree of dissimilarity between the parents’ origins might be an important catalyst in stimulating interethnic values, tastes and attitudes in children. For instance, having parents from Norway and Denmark might be quite different in many ways than having parents from Norway and Iraq. First of all, the children of the latter couple might be exposed to relatively more interethnic and intercultural environments and practices both within and outside the home. On the other hand, if the main mechanism is one through which only social integration matters, then the degree of cultural dissimilarity between the parents’ backgrounds should not matter and only having a Swedish parent might matter. Having a Swedish parent or a parent from countries that are culturally similar to Sweden might be the most important catalyst in terms of social integration. In addition, we might expect the influence of having a Swedish parent to be more important for those who have an origin from countries that are culturally dissimilar to Sweden. The table below presents the same regression as in specification (3) in Table 2. However, here, intermarriage of parents are divided into three categories, namely, ‘Within same value’ (parents are from different countries but from those that are within the same value system), ‘Across values’ (parents are from different countries that be-

---

<sup>5</sup> Inglehart (1997) and Inglehart and Baker (2000) show that these questions are highly correlated to a larger set of related questions, thus cover a much wider range of the value system of the related dimension. For e.g. the above mentioned questions are also related to views such as ‘protectionist attitudes toward foreign trade’, ‘environmental problems can be solved without international agreements’, ‘accepting national authority passively’, ‘rejection of divorce’, ‘emphasis of social conformity’, ‘absolute standards of good and evil’.

<sup>6</sup> See Dribe and Lundh (2010) for a detailed explanation of the construction of the four groups of countries.



long to different value systems) and finally ‘Swedish parent’ (one of the parents is born in Sweden and the other abroad).

Clear patterns emerge when looking at Table 4. First of all, if it were parental intermarriage per se that had a role in influencing children’s interethnic marriage behaviour then I would expect all the coefficients in the first row to be significant. However, this coefficient is only significant for families in the 1<sup>st</sup> value system. Thus, for countries that are not in the same group as Sweden, parental intermarriage within the same value system does not play a role on the likelihood of their sons’ and daughters’ intermarriage. For individuals with an origin that is culturally dissimilar to the Swedish society (Value 4 group), only having a Swedish parent increases the likelihood of own intermarriage. Considering that these are individuals who are born in Sweden, it is interesting to see that this is the most important predictor when compared to the other parental union types. However, for the first three groups of countries parental intermarriage across values is also positive and significant. As a next step I divide the ‘across values’ indicator into four indicator variables. This way I can see the exact ethnic union type of the parents.

**Table 4:** Dependent variable: Own intermarriage

<u>Parental</u> <u>int.mar.</u>	Male				Female			
	Value (1)	Value (2)	Value (3)	Value (4)	Value (1)	Value (2)	Value (3)	Value (4)
Within same value	0.044** (0.008)	0.009 (0.022)	-0.110 (0.112)	-0.078 (0.054)	0.057** (0.008)	-0.036 (0.023)	0.146 (0.115)	-0.058 (0.044)
Across values	0.053** (0.010)	0.082** (0.019)	0.108** (0.041)	0.009 (0.032)	0.037** (0.010)	0.095** (0.022)	0.088* (0.042)	-0.023 (0.031)
Swedish parent	0.075** (0.004)	0.135** (0.010)	0.180** (0.025)	0.145** (0.021)	0.081** (0.003)	0.164** (0.009)	0.201** (0.028)	0.189** (0.017)
Observations	56,344	4,895	1,833	1,429	64,438	5,424	2,425	2,034

Robust standard errors in parentheses  
\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

Table 5 presents the coefficients for the ‘parental intermarriage’ variable in separate regressions for each value system categorized according to the mother’s country of birth. This indicator variable is divided into six categories to see the exact combination of the parental intermarriage. The rest of the coefficients are not reported due to the length of the table. For individuals with a mother from Value (1) countries, all types of parental intermarriage increases their likelihood of forming an interethnic union except for having a father from culturally distant countries, that is, from Value (3) or (4) countries (these coefficients although not significant have a negative sign). This indicates, that it is not the cultural distance that affects children’s interethnic union formation behaviour but the parental cultural proximity to the Swedish culture.

**Table 5:** Dependent variable: Own intermarriage

<b>Males</b>				
-	<b>Mother</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Value</b>
<b>Parental int.mar.</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>Value</b>
	<b>(1)</b>			<b>(4)</b>
Within same value	0.041** (0.008)	0.009 (0.022)	-0.114 (0.112)	-0.085 (0.054)
<u>Across values</u>				
<u>Father</u>				
Value (1)		0.086** (0.021)	0.082 (0.050)	0.069 (0.039)
Value (2)	0.011** (0.003)		0.148** (0.056)	0.097* (0.041)
Value (3)	-0.005 (0.005)	0.031 (0.120)		-0.189** (0.070)
Value (4)	-0.003 (0.005)	0.077 (0.046)	0.071 (0.105)	
Swedish father	0.071** (0.004)	0.049* (0.020)	0.095* (0.044)	0.081* (0.036)
<b>Females</b>				
-	<b>Value</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Mother</b>	<b>Value</b>
<b>Parental int.mar.</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>(4)</b>
			<b>(3)</b>	
Within same value	0.054** (0.008)	-0.036 (0.023)	0.145 (0.115)	-0.066 (0.044)
<u>Across values</u>				
<u>Father</u>				
Value (1)		0.100** (0.024)	0.077 (0.057)	0.104** (0.038)
Value (2)	0.008** (0.003)		0.144 (0.088)	0.079 (0.047)
Value (3)	-0.002 (0.005)	0.030 (0.098)		-0.238** (0.055)
Value (4)	-0.008 (0.006)	0.100* (0.046)	0.056 (0.070)	
Swedish father	0.078** (0.003)	0.064** (0.023)	0.122* (0.050)	0.095** (0.035)

With regard to cultural proximity to the Swedish society / social integration, the same pattern can be observed for other groups of countries of origin as well. For e.g. for daughters with mothers from value 2 and 4 countries, having a father from a country that is culturally similar to Sweden (value 1) increases their likelihood of intermarriage. For both sons and daughters with mothers from value 4 countries, the subdivision of the 'across values' variable into three categories show that having a father from a country distant to the Swedish society value (3) has a negative influence on their likelihood of intermarrying. These results indicate that it is not the parental intermarriage per se that has an influence on the children's interethnic union formation behaviour but the type of parental mix is important. For individuals with a background that is culturally distant to the Swedish society, having a father from those countries that are culturally similar to the Swedish society has a positive im-

pact on their likelihood of intermarrying. Having a Swedish father increases children's likelihood of forming an interethnic union significantly for all groups. These results indicate that even for second generation immigrants, having a parent/parents from Sweden or countries culturally close to the Swedish society is important for their ethnic union formation decisions. Although, this analyses cannot identify the actual mechanisms of intergenerational transmission of union formation behaviour, these results point to the importance of social integration as a catalyst in this transmission.

## Conclusions

This paper has explored intergenerational transmission of interethnic union formation behaviour within families, using population-wide data. The data allows us to connect spouses to each other and each individual to their parents. Thus, we are able to track birth place of all individuals in each family and family in law. The results indicate that having intermarried parents significantly increase the likelihood of second generation sons' and daughters' intermarriage. However, the detailed decomposition of parental intermarriage types indicates that this transmission varies by country of origin groups as well as parental intermarriage type. Thus, it is not the distance in cultural similarity of the countries of origin of the intermarried parents or the intermarriage of the parents itself that affects children's interethnic union formation behaviour, but having parents from countries that are similar to the Swedish society is what matters. This result draws attention to the importance of social integration in interethnic union formation patterns even for the second generation. Thus, the observed intergenerational transmission of intermarriage within families is to a large extent due to having a Swedish parent or having a parent from a country that is culturally similar to the Swedish society. Thus, who marries whom in the ethnic marriage market needs to be studied further. To the extent that ethnic groups intra-marry or intermarry within their social value system versus across their value system and especially to ethnic Swedes will determine ethnic and cultural continuities in the next generation and diversity in the society.

This also draws attention to the potential characteristics inherited within families of interethnic parents who are from societies with value systems similar to the Swedish society and the role these characteristics play in blending in the Swedish marriage market. These characteristics might be unobservable, such as attitudes towards ethnic / religious others or positive discrimination in the marriage market, or observable characteristics related to residential or educational segregation. The fact that native born children's marriage patterns are strongly influenced by whether they have a parent from a Value (1) country or Sweden implies that the marriage market within Sweden even for the native born is divided by social boundaries.

## References

- Bisin, A. and Verdier, T. (2000). Beyond the Melting Pot: Cultural Transmission, Marriage, and the Evolution of Ethnic and Religious Traits. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(3): 955-988.
- Bisin, A. and Verdier, T. (2001). The Economics of Cultural Transmission and the Dynamics of Preferences. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 97(2): 298-319.
- Chiswick, B. R. and Houseworth, C. A., (2008). Ethnic Intermarriage among Immigrants: Human Capital and Assortative Mating. *IZA DP*: 3740.
- Çelikaksoy, A., H. S. Nielsen and M. Verner (2006). Marriage Migration: Just another Case of Positive Assortative Matching? *Review of Economics of the Household*, 4(3): 271-293.
- Dribe, M and Lundh, C. (2010). Exogamy, cultural dissimilarity, and union dissolution. A longitudinal study of immigrants and natives in Sweden 1990-2005. *WP Series: Center for Economic Demography*.
- Duncan, B. and Trejo, S. J. (2007). Ethnic identification, intermarriage and unmeasured progress by Mexican Americans. In: G. J. Borjas (ed.), *Mexican Immigration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, E. and Guttman, R. (1984). Mate selection in man: Evidence, theory and outcome. *Social Biology*, 31(4): 243-278.
- European Population Committee (2002). *The Demographic Characteristics of Immigrant Populations*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Fernandez R., Guner, N. and Knowles, J. (2005). Love and Money: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Household Sorting and Inequality. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(1): 273-344.
- Goldscheider, C. (2007). Outpartnering and integration: Attitudes and behavior of young adults in Sweden. Pp. 73-95 in: E. Bernhart; C. Goldscheider; F. Goldscheider and G. Bjeren (eds.) *Immigration, Gender, and Family Transitions to Adulthood in Sweden*, New York: University Press of America..
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. and Baker, W. E. (2000). Modernization, Cultural Change and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review*, 65(1): 19-51.
- Inglehart, R. and Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change and democracy*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalmijn, M. (1998). Intermarriage and Homogamy: Causes, Patterns, and Trends. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 24(1): 395-421.
- Mare, R. D. (1991). Five decades of educational assortative mating. *American Sociological Review*, 56(1): 15-32.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L. and Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2(1): 415-444.
- Meng, X. and Gregory, R. G. (2005). Intermarriage and the economic assimilation of immigrants. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 23(1): 135-175.
- Okumura, T and Usui, E. (2010). Do parents' social skills influence their children's sociability? *IZA DP*: 5324.
- Pencavel, J. (1998). Assortative mating by schooling and the work behavior of wives and husbands. *American Economic Review*, 88(2): 326-329.

Smits, J., Ultee, W. and Lammers, J. (1998). Educational Homogamy in 65 Countries: An Explanation of Differences in Openness Using Country-Level Explanatory Variables. *American Sociological Review*, 63(2): 264-285.

**Appendix**

**Country of origin groups**

**Rational Self expression**



**Traditional Survival**

<u>Value group 1</u>	<u>Value group 2</u>	<u>Value group 3</u>	<u>Value group 4</u>	
Sweden	Bosnia-Her.	Ireland	Malta	Somalia
Denmark	Croatia	Cyprus	Portugal	Sudan
Finland	Macedonia	Spain	Poland	South Africa
Iceland	Serbia	Argentina	Bolivia	Tanzania
Norway	Slovenia	Barbados	Chile	Togo
Belgium	Albania	Brazil	Guatemala	Tunisia
France	Bulgaria	Colombia	Peru	Uganda
Luxemburg	Estonia	Costa Rica	Algeria	Zambia
The Netherlands	Latvia	Dominican Rep.	Angola	Zimbabwe
Austria	Lithuania	Ecuador	Burundi	Iraq
Switzerland	Moldavia	El Salvador	Egypt	Jordan
Great Britain	Romania	Haiti	Ivory Coast	Lebanon
Germany	Russia	Honduras	Eritrea	Palestine
Greece	Slovakia	Jamaica	Ethiopia	Syria
Italy	Ukraine	Mexico	Gambia	Azerbaijan
Czech Republic	Hungary	Nicaragua	Ghana	Bangladesh
Canada	Belarus	Panama	Guinea	Philippines
Israel	Armenia	Trinidad&Tob.	Guinea-Bissau	Georgia
Japan	Hong Kong	Uruguay	Cameroon	India
New Zealand	China	Venezuela	Cap Verde	Indonesia
	North Korea	USA	Kenya	Iran
	South Korea	UAE	Congo	Kazakhstan
	Mongolia	Kuwait	Liberia	Kyrgyzstan
	Taiwan	Saudi Arabia	Libya	Nepal
		Turkey	Madagascar	Pakistan
		Yemen	Morocco	Singapore
		Afghanistan	Mauritius	Sri Lanka
		Cambodia	Mozambique	Tajikistan
		Laos	Namibia	Turkmenistan
		Malaysia	Nigeria	Uzbekistan
		Thailand	Rwanda	
		Vietnam	Senegal	
		Australia	Sierra Leone	