

Ethnic Variations in Characteristics of First Unions among Asian American Young Adults

Yen-hsin Alice Cheng

Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica
No. 128, Sec. 2, Academia Rd., Taipei 11529, Taiwan
E-mail: aliceyh@gate.sinica.edu.tw

Abstract

This study investigates the characteristics of first cohabitations and first marriages formed by Asian American young adults, focusing specifically on ethnic variations between East Asian, Filipino, and South Asian Americans. The fourth wave of Add Health data, which collects complete union histories of all respondents between the ages of 25 to 32 in years 2007-2008, offers a unique opportunity to study first unions formed by recent young immigrants. The findings show that the level of cohabitation is very similar across all Asian subgroups when socio-demographic covariates are considered. East Asians and Filipinos delay marriage longer than do South Asians. Filipinos are more likely to turn a first cohabitation into a marriage and to have a first marriage preceded by cohabitation than are the other two groups. Finally, East Asians are significantly more likely to have a

white cohabiting or married partner. Compared with their East Asian peers, Filipinos are more likely to cohabit with Asian coethnics or with individuals from other minority groups than with whites. The analyses presented here reveal that ethnic variations should not be overlooked when studying cohabitation and marriage among Asian Americans.

Key Words: Asian American, race/ethnicity, marriage, intermarriage, cohabitation

Racial and ethnic variations in marriage and cohabitation patterns have been a core concern of U.S. family research. Numerous studies have documented the different values and union characteristics observed between minority groups and Americans of European ancestry (Casper & Bianchi, 2002; Crissey, 2005; Manning & Landale, 1996; Manning & Smock, 1995; Schoen & Cheng, 2006; Schoen, Landale, & Daniels, 2007; Staples & Mirande, 1980). Despite the extensive literature on racial differences in union formation and heated discussions about dramatic family changes in recent decades, relatively little research has focused on Asian Americans—the fastest growing minority group in the U.S. (Lee & Zhou, 2004; McLoyd, Cauce, Takeuchi, & Wilson, 2000). The fact that the Asian American population is projected to grow from 1% of the total U.S. population in 1970 to 10% in 2050 (Hoeffel, Rastogi, Kim, & Shahid, 2012; Martin & Midgley, 2003) underscores the necessity of devoting more attention to investigating important issues such as the ethnic variations in marriage timing and the prevalence of premarital cohabitation among Asian Americans.

One key explanation for this lacuna in empirical studies is a lack of data (i.e., sufficiently large sample size) for Asian Americans in major national family and social surveys. Such data limitations have led to the use of the pan-ethnic group “Asian American” as a common practice in most studies. Yet, the fact that Asian Americans come from more than twenty different countries and have varying socioeconomic backgrounds and modes of entry into the U.S. makes them a very diverse group (Zhou, 2007). Scholars have long suggested that broad ethnic variations in outcomes exist within the larger pan-ethnic category of “Asian Americans.” However, data limitations make it difficult to explore subgroup variations in family patterns because of insufficient event occurrences. In turn, very few studies have attempted to describe and explain ethnic diversity in union formation patterns between Asian American subgroups.

This study aims to contribute to the literature by investigating ethnic variations in the characteristics of first cohabitation and first marriage formed by Asian American young adults. This investigation is important for several reasons. First, in an era of rapid family change, very little is known about whether different Asian American subgroups experience similar marriage decline. Entry into marriage is a critical marker during the transition to adulthood. It is imperative for researchers to understand whether the differential socioeconomic profiles observed between Asian American ethnic groups are also reflected in their likelihood of forming a marital union.

Second, despite rapid increases in cohabitation in recent decades, we know very little about patterns of cohabitation among Asian Americans in the U.S. It is very likely that the prevalence of pre-marital cohabitation for Asian Americans resembles those of their counterparts in Asia, given that a large proportion of them are first- and second-generation immigrants (Zhou & Lee, 2004). While prevalence of cohabitation in the less developed part of Asia is unknown, research has documented rising cohabitation rates in the more advanced East Asian economies and the Philippines (Lesthaeghe, 2010; Williams, Kabamalan, & Ogena, 2007). Does the prevalence of cohabitation among Asian Americans vary by immigrants' country of origin? The fact that cohabiting unions are more fragile makes knowing which Asian subgroups are more vulnerable to union instability a critical issue. Moreover, are cohabiting unions formed by certain subgroups more likely to end in marriage than others? Answers to these questions can have policy implications for both the adults and children involved in these unions.

Third, it has been documented that Asian Americans, along with Hispanics and American Indians, are much more likely to marry a white partner than are African Americans. Is this pattern uniform across all ethnic subgroups? It is reasonable to believe that the answer is negative, due to the differential socioeconomic profiles between Asian American subgroups. Socioeconomic status affects contacts and interactions between the majority and minority

groups within a society, which further transfer into different levels of interracial marriage patterns (Gordon, 1964; Lieberman & Waters, 1988; Qian, 1997). The investigation of this issue is important in understanding the level of social integration into the mainstream society between Asian subgroups, since interracial marriage is indicative of social distance between minority groups and the host society.

This study employs data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) to examine ethnic variations in first union characteristics among recent cohorts of Asian American young adults. The unique design of Add Health—the oversampling of youths with Asian ancestry and the complete union histories of all respondents between the ages of 25 to 32 in Wave 4 (2007-2008)—makes this investigation a feasible plan. This paper aims to compare three Asian ethnic categories: East Asian, Filipino, and South Asian Americans (which also includes a very few respondents from Central Asia). The next section will provide justifications for such an ethnic breakdown. Three research questions will be addressed by this study: (1) Are there ethnic variations in the likelihood of young adults who will join a cohabiting or a marital union by Wave 4 among Asian Americans? (2) Are there ethnic variations in the outcomes of first cohabitation and the prevalence of a first marriage being preceded by cohabitation? (3) Do the patterns of interracial partnering for cohabitation and marriage vary by Asian subgroup? If so, which group is more likely to partner with whites versus with other Asian coethnics or other minority groups?

I. Prior Research

A. Asian Ethnic Diversity: Socioeconomic Profiles and Cultural Values

The usage of a pan-ethnic, overarching label of “Asian American” as a racial category masks the demographic diversity

observed between Asian ethnic groups. The current Asian American population comes from more than twenty countries in the Asia-Pacific region. According to the Census 2000 data, the three largest groups of ethnic Asian Americans are of Chinese, Filipino, and Asian Indian ancestry (Xie & Goyette, 2004). The other populations of ethnic groups come from Korea, Japan, Vietnam, and several other South Asian countries, such as Bangladesh, Cambodia, Lao, the Hmong, and Thailand. Such cultural diversity only emerged after US immigration reform in the 1960s. Over the past few decades, the rapid growth of migration from the Far East has resulted in the dominance of first-generation immigrants from various Asian countries (Zhou & Xiong, 2005). Hence, the socioeconomic status of immigrants in their native countries and the modes of entry become important determinants of Asian Americans' adjustments and life chances in the United States.

Unlike Hispanic immigrants who are largely uneducated and low-skilled, Asian American immigrants are more diverse in socioeconomic makeup that reveals stark regional variations. This study will separate the Asian American population into three sub-groups: East Asians, Filipinos, and South Asians. The rationale for such a categorization is largely because Chinese, Filipinos, and Asian Indians are the three largest ethnic groups among all Asian Americans, based on the Census 2000 report (Barnes & Bennett, 2002). Generally speaking, immigrants from East Asian countries are much better-educated and are over-represented in white-collar, professional occupations, whereas immigrants from South Asia tend to have more limited human capital at their disposal. They tend to complete few years of education and have lower family income than their East Asian counterparts (Xie & Goyette, 2004). Differential motivations for departing from their homeland have been a major explanation for their distinct socioeconomic profiles. The post-1970 immigrants from East Asia have selectively come to the U.S. in search of advanced post-graduate studies or further professional development. In contrast, immigrants from South Asia

largely migrated to the U.S. in seek of asylum from their war-torn home countries (Zhou, 2007).

Filipino immigrants, on the other hand, have a longer history of immigration to the U.S. than most other Asian immigrants. The first wave of Filipino immigrants arrived at the U.S. continent after the Philippines became the first American colony following the Spanish-American War at the turn of the twentieth century. The Philippines were under deep U.S. influence during the half-century American colonial governance and English is one of the two official languages used and taught in the country. Later on, the waves of post-1965 immigration to the U.S. brought in numerous professional, white-collar Filipinos seeking better career opportunities (Xie & Goyette, 2004). This unique colonial and immigration history has made Filipino Americans relatively more acculturated than other Asian immigrants. In a study conducted in San Diego to adult children of Asian immigrants, 90% of Filipinos prefer to speak only English and nearly 60% of them identify themselves as “Hyphenated American”—both figures are significantly higher than all the other ethnic groups (i.e., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, Hmong, and Chinese) included in the study (Zhou & Xiong, 2005). Exposure to U.S. culture from the colonial past and the higher English proficiency among Filipino Americans are likely to bring their values and attitudes closer to the mainstream American culture. Their socioeconomic profile tends to fall between those of immigrants from East Asia and South Asia, but in general is much closer to the former than the latter group (Reeves & Bennett, 2004).

Turning to cultural values, given that Asian Americans are over-represented by first- and second-generation immigrants, their values and attitudes inevitably resemble those held by compatriots in the sending countries. Foner (1997) stated well how immigrant families engage in an active process of fusing together old traditions and new social codes learned in the United States: “. . . the family is seen as a place where there is a dynamic interplay between structure,

culture, and agency—where creative culture-building takes place in the context of external social and economic forces as well as immigrants’ pre-migration cultural frameworks” (961). Moreover, the convenience of international transportation and communication technology facilitate social diffusion of values and ideas so that traditional attitudes toward union formation from the homeland are maintained. They are as important as those learned in the new society in understanding immigrants’ behaviors and adaptations in America. Thus, regional variations in socioeconomic development and phases of demographic transition in Asia offer valuable points of reference for conceptualizing how members of different Asian ethnic groups decide when and how to engage in family-building in their new homes.

Although East Asian countries share a Confucian heritage that emphasizes the centrality of family, dramatic demographic changes have been witnessed in the past few decades in all advanced economies: declining first marriage rates, rising prevalence of cohabitation, and plummeting fertility levels (Jones, Straughan, & Chan, 2009; Lesthaeghe, 2010). Men and women are postponing marriages and many entirely forego matrimony. The extent to which the dramatic decline in marriage rates in East Asia is offset by more cohabitation is generally quite difficult to estimate, though scholars have found a rising trend toward greater acceptance and practice of co-residential unions in Japan and Taiwan (Lesthaeghe, 2010; Raymo, Iwasawa, & Bumpass, 2009). The percentages of Japanese men and women reported as having ever cohabited indicate an increase from about 10% among the 1960-64 cohorts, to about 21% for the 1975-79 cohorts (Raymo et al., 2009). The percentage of Taiwanese women aged 20 to 49 who reported having ever cohabited also shows a leap from about 11% to 20% between the 1998 and 2004 Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) surveys (Lesthaeghe, 2010). Estimates for the prevalence of cohabitation in other East Asian countries, such as Singapore and South Korea, are not available.

In contrast, although South Asian countries have also experienced declining marriage rates over the past few decades (Jones, 2005), non-marriage by choice is still not considered normative and is often seen as failing in one’s filial duty in countries like Vietnam (Williams & Guest, 2005). Marriage is still virtually universal, particularly for men (East-West Center, 2002). Furthermore, prior research has indicated that South and Southeast Asian men and women generally marry earlier than their peers in East Asia, which is characterized by dramatically delayed marriages in the twenties and foregone marriages at older ages (Jones & Gubhaju, 2009). In the Philippines, although proportions of never-married men and women in their thirties have increased since 1960, the percentage of never-married population between the ages 45-49 has remained relatively stable at 4-7% for nearly half a century (Jones, 2005). Marriages are largely delayed but not foregone in the Philippines. Co-residential unions have been on the rise for recent young cohorts of Filipino men and women. Analysis of the 2002 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study reveals that about 58% of those aged 25-27 years old have cohabited at least once (Williams et al., 2007). Non-marital births have soared to a striking 50% in 2014 (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2016).

As early marriage is not as common as it used to be in most regions of East and South Asia (Williams & Guest, 2005), it can be expected that immigrants from these regions will also experience changes in family values and what they consider as ideal timing for union formation. The distinct socioeconomic profiles of East and South Asian Americans are then crucial to determining which groups remain more traditional than others, given that individuals with more education tend to be more secular and more receptive to new values and attitudes during the demographic transition process (Lesthaeghe & van de Kaa, 1986). On the other hand, demographic indicators show that family changes have been observed among young Filipinos, though the scope of behavioral shifts in marriage is not as dramatic as those found in advanced East Asian economies;

still, rates of premarital cohabitation and non-marital births are drastically higher than those reported in any East Asian country.

B. Racial/Ethnic Differences in Union Formation

An extensive literature can be found on intermarriage patterns between Asian Americans and Americans of European ancestry. Yet, research on intermarriage patterns often does not incorporate cohabitation into the analyses, and studies that look at cohabitation behaviors among Asian Americans barely exist. One study that touches upon cohabitation is that by Liang and Ito (1999). They used the 5% Public Use Micro-Data Sample from the 1990 U.S. Census to investigate union formation patterns of five Asian ethnic groups in the New York City region. Individuals in the analytical sample were born between the mid-1920s and 1970. Although cohabitation is included in this study, the statistics on ethnic differentials in intermarriage and inter-cohabitation were not separated due to limited event counts.¹ Overall, they discovered that among 20-64-year-olds, regardless of generational status, Japanese and Filipino Americans have much higher percentages of intermarriage and inter-cohabitation with individuals from other racial/ethnic groups compared to Chinese, Korean, or Asian Indian Americans. Furthermore, the proportions of Asian Americans who marry to or cohabit with whites are much higher among East Asian (i.e., Chinese, Korean, and Japanese Americans) and Filipino Americans than among their Asian Indian peers.

A recent study by Min and Kim (2009) reported on ethnic variation in intermarriages among Asian Americans. Using data from the American Community Survey (ACS) collected between 2001 and 2006, they explored single-race Asian Americans' intermarriage and cross-generational marriages by ethnic group and

¹ The percentages of cohabitation observed among the ethnic groups are highest among Japanese (2.1%) and Filipino (1.7%). Comparable statistics for Chinese, Korean, and Indian Americans are 1.1%, 1.1%, and 0.6%.

gender. The findings show that Japanese, Filipino, Chinese, and Korean Americans have the highest rates of exogamous marriages (69.3%, 62.5%, 56.4%, and 54% respectively). In contrast, Asian Indian, Vietnamese, and other Asian Americans have much lower rates of inter-racial/ethnic marriages than their East Asian and Filipino counterparts. Such a strong regional pattern emerged because Native-born Indians and Vietnamese Americans maintain strong family ties and attachment to their own heritages, both culturally and linguistically (Min & Kim, 2009). Moreover, their study also revealed the much higher rates of intermarriages to other racial minority groups among Filipino and Japanese Americans than among other East Asian or Asian Indian Americans. More social contacts with other minority groups among the Filipino Americans and higher generational status among Japanese Americans were argued as two major factors leading to such ethnic differentials.

Taken together, although Asian Indians have a relatively more advantageous socioeconomic profile in U.S. society, they have been shown to have much lower intermarriage rates with other racial groups (Liang & Ito, 1999; Min & Kim, 2009). Native-born Asian Indian Americans are much more likely to marry first or 1.5-generation Asian Indians and the proportions marrying whites are much closer to other South Asian Americans than to East Asian coethnics (Min & Kim, 2009). Two potential explanations to this deviation from other Asian ethnic groups' intermarriage patterns have been suggested in previous research—religious identification (Sheth, 1995) and the practice of arranged marriage in the Indian immigrant communities (Foner, 1997; Min & Kim, 2009). Religion plays a central role in marital choices because it is linked with core values and cultural practices, which are often barriers to intermarriage (Kalmijn & van Tubergen, 2010). In addition, religious intermarriage is often linked with higher risk of union dissolution (Lehrer & Chiswick, 1993). Hence, it is not surprising to find that a recent study reported that Hindu/Buddhist groups are more endogamous than Protestant groups in the United States

(Kalmijn & van Tubergen, 2010). Such racial variations in intermarriage rates are due to religio-cultural differences between the minority and larger society and to the stronger social boundaries kept in the minority group. The practice of arranged marriage further reinforces the pattern of racial/ethnic endogamy among Asian Indians. Both of these factors have led to more traditional union formation patterns among the Asian Indian population in the U.S. Hence, they were grouped together with other South Asians in later analyses.

Based on the literature reviewed so far, the variations in socioeconomic profiles and cultural values between Asian immigrants from East Asia, South Asia, and the Philippines are valuable in conceptualizing ethnic variations in first union characteristics among Asian Americans. Together with the empirical patterns of ethnic differences in union formation discussed above, four research hypotheses are posed for this study:

- H1: Filipino Americans are more likely to have cohabited than East or South Asian Americans.
- H2: East Asian and Filipino Americans are less likely to be married during young adulthood than their South Asian counterparts.
- H3: First marriages formed by Filipino Americans are more likely to be preceded by cohabitation, and their first cohabitations are more likely to end in marriage than those of East and South Asian Americans.
- H4: East Asian and Filipino Americans are more likely to partner with whites in both marital and cohabiting unions than their South Asian counterparts.

II. Research Design

A. Data

The data come from the first and fourth waves of the Add Health that were collected in years 1994-1995 and 2007-2008.

Add Health was designed to study health-related behaviors of a cohort of adolescents in Grades 7-12 during the 1994-1995 academic year (Harris et al., 2003). The data were collected mainly through adolescent in-home interviews. The first wave of Add Health was collected between 1994 and 1995. Follow-up Wave 2 interviews were conducted between 1995 and 1996. The Wave 3 interviews were conducted with respondents in young adulthood between 2001 and 2002. Finally, the Wave 4 interviews were completed during the years 2007-2008 when respondents were between the ages of 25 and 32.

In the Wave 4 data, all respondents were asked to provide a retrospective report on all cohabiting and marital unions they had ever formed by the time of interview. Within each union, five possible types of relationship segments were also specified (i.e., marriage, cohabitation, pregnancy, dating, or most recent relationship). For example, if a marriage was preceded by cohabitation, the first segment of this relationship would be coded as cohabitation and the second as marriage. Within each relationship, the age and race of the partner and the start and end dates of each relationship segment were also reported. This rich relationship history data facilitate the study of premarital cohabitation: unions that pass through “relationship transitions” with the same partner and also partner characteristics.

B. Analytical Sample

The respondents included in this study are those who participated in the Wave 1 and Wave 4 interviews and those who have a valid longitudinal sampling weight. A total of 20,745 youths aged 12 to 20 were interviewed in Wave 1, of which 15,701 participated in Wave 4. About a thousand respondents ($n=1,041$) who belong to the “other race” category (i.e., American Indians and Pacific islanders or those whose self-identified race is “other”) were dropped from the qualifying 15,701 adults, leading to a sample size

of 14,660. There are 8,148 whites, 3,168 African Americans, 2,302 Hispanics and 1,042 Asian Americans. There were originally 1,582 Asian American youths interviewed in Wave 1, but only 1,037 were re-interviewed in Wave 4. Using the self-reports on Asian background, three Asian subgroups were created: East Asians (n=369, including Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans), Filipinos (n=411), and South Asians (n=257, including Indians, Vietnamese, and other Asians). Five cases lacked a valid report to this question and were dropped from analyses, along with a few cases with missing values on maternal education and generational status. The final analytical sample consists of 14,618 respondents of all races, of which 1,037 are Asian Americans.

C. Variables and Measurements

The outcome variables for the three sets of analyses are: (1) dichotomous variables of ever cohabited or ever married by Wave 4; (2) dichotomous variables of whether a first cohabitation ended in marriage, or whether a first marriage was preceded by cohabitation; (3) the race of first cohabiting or marital partners. In addition, covariates of age, sex, family structure, maternal education, and generational status were also included in the models. These variables all come from the Wave 1 survey, except for age. Given that Add Health is a multi-cohort survey, respondents' ages at Wave 4 (between ages 25 to 32) were controlled. A dummy variable of male was created for sex. Family structure is considered because prior research has pointed out that children with divorced or step-parents are more likely to form marital or cohabiting unions earlier than those from intact two-biological-parent families (Michael & Tuma, 1985). This study identified two-biological-parent families, single-parent families, step-families, and other families (i.e., children living with relatives or grandparents). In addition, maternal education is also controlled because children of better educated mothers have fewer transitions to cohabitation and marriage in young adulthood among white and

African American women (Schoen, Landale, Daniels, & Cheng, 2009). A four-category maternal education variable was created: less than high school, high school graduates, some college, and university and above. Less than high school is used as the reference group. Generational status is undoubtedly important in immigrant studies and thus is also included in the analyses. A three-category variable was created, with the third-generation as reference group.

D. Missing Values and Complex Survey Design

There are few missing cases in the analytical samples. For race, maternal education, and generational status, the percentages of missing cases are about 1% or fewer. Listwise deletion was used to handle missing data. The complex survey design of the Add Health study was also taken into account during model estimations. Appropriate longitudinal sampling weights were applied to the statistical models. In addition, clustering and stratifying variables were both applied to adjust the standard errors.

E. Statistical Analyses

Descriptive statistics are first presented to offer an overview of the study population and to point out general patterns of differences in union characteristics in each racial/ethnic group. Statistics are shown for all race/ethnicity groups as well as for all Asian subgroups. Next, logistic regression models were fit to explore the differences in first union behaviors, such as the likelihood of forming a cohabiting and a marital union by Wave 4, the outcome of a first cohabitation and whether a first marriage is preceded by a pre-marital cohabitation. Finally, the race of the first cohabiting/marital partner by racial/ethnic group was also examined. Logistic regression models were first fit for all respondents and then for Asian Americans only to reveal subgroup differences as shown in Tables 2 and 3.

III. Results

A. Descriptive Statistics

The first four columns of Table 1 show the racial differences in various individual, family, and first union characteristics. When comparing across racial groups, Asian American young adults have higher educational achievement at Wave 4 (48.09% completed college) and more advantaged socioeconomic profile at home than their white, African American, and Hispanic peers. Nearly 70% of them come from two-biological-parent families and about half of them have mothers with at least some college education. For nativity status, Asian Americans are heavily represented by first-generation young adults (43.36%), a pattern not seen in other racial groups. Young Asian Americans have the highest percentage of never experiencing cohabitation by Wave 4 (41.30%) among all groups. They are also more likely to stay single in young adulthood (55.81%) than their white and Hispanic counterparts (45.57% and 51.04%). The percentage of first cohabitation formed by Asian Americans that end in marriage (44.73%) is only higher than African Americans but lower than whites and Hispanics. Asian American young adults also have the highest percentage of inter-racial first cohabiting unions (51%) among all four races. As for first marital union, only slightly more than half of all first marriages (51.93%) formed by Asian American young adults are preceded by a cohabitation, which is much lower than any of the other three racial groups. About 44% of the first marriages formed by Asian Americans are racially exogamous unions, which is again much higher than the other three races. When first cohabitations are compared with first marriages, the percentage of Asian Americans who had a white cohabiting partner (27%) is roughly the same as the percentage of Asian Americans who married a white partner (25%). This pattern can also be observed in the other racial

groups, indicating that cohabitation, as a relatively informal union, is not significantly more likely to be racially exogamous than marriage for all races.

Moving to the last three columns shown in Table 1, East Asian and Filipino Americans tend to have better socio-demographic profiles than South Asians. This is reflected in the percentage of young adults who received some college education or a college degree at Wave 4 and the average maternal education level across groups. There are relatively more first-generation immigrants among Filipino and South Asian immigrants. As for union experiences in the next panel, South Asian Americans (42.71%) are slightly more likely than other two Asian ethnic groups (41.41% for East Asians and 39.68% for Filipinos) to have never cohabited by Wave 4, but the differences do not show statistical significance. In contrast, East Asian and Filipino young adults are more likely to remain unmarried (64.61% and 57.97%) than their South Asian counterparts (46.30%).

In the next panel, Asian Americans of East Asian origin (37.13%) are particularly less likely than the other two subgroups to make the transition to marriage after first cohabitation (48.37% and 49.49%). As for the characteristics of first cohabiting partner, the tendency to have a white cohabiting partner is much more pronounced among East Asians than the other two Asian subgroups. Nearly two-fifths of East Asians reported a first cohabitation with a white partner, while the percentages for Filipinos and South Asians are 13.73% and 26.84%.

In the bottom panel, a smaller share of South Asian American married individuals (43.24%) had premarital cohabitation than the other two Asian groups (57.12% for East Asians and 62.22% for Filipinos). The tendency to marry a white partner is the strongest among East Asians (49.17%) than among the other two Asian subgroups (13.04% for Filipinos and 18.61% for South Asians).

Table 1 Socio-Demographic and Union Characteristics by Racial/Ethnic Group (all figures in percentages except sample sizes)

	White	Black	Hispanics	Asian	East Asian	Filipino	South Asian
All Respondents: (unweighted N)	8,135	3,149	2,297	1,037	369	411	257
Educational Attainment at W4							
Less than High School	8	13.33	13.93	2.58	1.91	0.81	4.68
High School	16.74	21.55	21.76	11.09	10.36	9.06	13.62
Some College	42.34	4.03	46.05	38.24	26.90	52.31	36.97
University and more	33.14	21.09	18.26	48.09	60.83	37.82	44.73
Family Structure							
Two-parent family	60.86	25.65	55.02	69.73	72.17	63.67	72.37
Single-parent family	18.05	44.59	23.41	11.72	15.40	14.03	21.07
Stepfamily	17.02	13.92	15.72	8.84	8.25	15.77	3.86
Other family	4.07	12.85	5.85	4.31	4.18	6.54	2.69
Maternal Education							
Less than High School	11.49	19.13	47.17	23.56	14.20	10.49	40.95
High School	45.67	47.17	30.70	25.52	32.65	19.45	23.38
Some College	18.87	15.48	12.97	12.07	9.13	17.03	9.98
University and more	23.97	18.22	9.16	38.85	44.03	53.03	25.70
Generational Status							
1st generation	1.17	1.72	23.16	43.36	32.03	52.66	46.23
2nd generation	4.89	4.13	39.24	41.35	38.83	40.00	43.16
3rd generation	93.94	94.15	37.59	15.29	29.14	7.34	10.60
Number of cohabitation by W4							
Never cohabited	26.64	27.05	33.72	41.30	41.41	39.68	42.71
one	40.40	38.62	41.82	38.40	37.61	44.51	33.34
two	20.33	21.78	15.04	13.73	12.37	11.14	17.32
three	7.84	7.57	5.84	3.98	6.06	2.78	3.24
four or more	4.79	4.98	3.58	2.59	2.55	1.89	3.39

(to be continued)

“Ethnic Variations in Characteristics of First Unions” 195

	White	Black	Hispanics	Asian	East Asian	Filipino	South Asian
Number of marriage by W4							
Never married	45.57	69.22	51.04	55.81	64.61	57.97	46.30
one	49.35	29.04	45.68	41.86	35.27	40.02	49.10
two or more	5.07	1.74	3.29	2.33	0.11	2.01	4.60
Cohabitors:							
(unweighted N)	5,986	2,262	1,513	620	208	259	150
% end in marriage	54.19	32.20	46.89	44.73	37.13	48.37	49.49
Race of first cohabiting partner							
White	86.83	8.05	29.89	27.43	42.13	13.73	26.84
Black	2.76	82.16	6.36	7.40	6.46	4.24	11.16
Hispanics	6.45	5.69	57.67	11.07	7.24	15.82	8.98
Asian	1.81	1.20	2.78	49.00	36.81	60.01	50.77
Other race	2.15	2.89	3.31	5.10	7.36	6.19	2.25
Marrieds:							
(unweighted N)	4,642	1,022	1,211	444	114	203	124
% preceded by cohabitation	66.25	59.87	55.05	51.93	57.12	62.22	43.24
Race of first married partner							
White	90.10	8.61	23.87	24.74	49.17	13.04	18.61
Black	1.64	81.51	3.16	6.20	3.19	6.11	8.12
Hispanics	5.24	6.37	68.29	7.69	6.96	7.17	7.69
Asian	1.14	0.95	1.66	55.60	40.61	67.31	56.81
Other race	1.87	2.55	3.02	5.77	0.07	6.38	8.77

B. Regression Analyses

(A) Who Remained Never Cohabited by Wave 4?

The next set of analyses presented in Table 2c further explores why certain groups are less likely to cohabit than others. As shown in the left-hand side of Table 2c, the odds of all three Asian subgroups to have never cohabited by Wave 4 are about one time (100%) higher than for whites. Model 2 shows that socio-demographic characteristics explain part of the story. In addition, the reason why Asian Americans are more likely to have never cohabited than whites is mostly driven by generational status. First-generation (OR=1.76, $p < .001$) and second-generation (OR=1.34, $p < .05$) young adults are particularly likely to never cohabit. Among all Asian Americans, there are no significant subgroup differences in terms of the likelihood of never cohabitating (see right-hand side of Table 2c), even when most covariates were taken into account in Model 2. Thus, research hypothesis H1, that stated Filipino Americans have a higher likelihood of cohabitating than the other two groups is not supported. Instead, the effect of generation is very strong—the odds of first-generation Asian American young adults to have never cohabited are twice as high as the odds for the third-generation.

(B) Who Remained Unmarried by Wave 4?

Table 2m shows that East Asian and Filipino Americans are significantly more likely than whites to remain unmarried, even after socio-demographic covariates and generational status are taken into account. The odds of both groups to be single by Wave 4 were roughly 125% higher (OR=2.25 for East Asians and OR=1.85 for Filipinos) than for whites. The statistical significance of both groups is not attenuated even after nativity status was taken into account. When the analytical sample is restricted to only Asian Americans, South Asians in particular are significantly less likely to

Table 2c Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression Models Predicting Never Been Cohabited by Wave 4 by Racial/Ethnic Group (weighted data, N=14,618 & n_{Asian}=1,037)

	N=14,618		N=1,037	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
White	(ref.)	(ref.)	--	--
Black	1.02	1.29*	--	--
Hispanic	1.39**	1.28†	--	--
East Asian	1.95*	1.34	(ref.)	(ref.)
Filipinos	1.82*	1.12	0.94	0.81
Other Asians	2.10*	1.45	1.13	1.04
Male	1.07	1.10†	1.74**	1.73*
Age at Wave 4	0.96*	0.97	0.95	0.92
Family Status				
Two-parent family (ref.)	--	--	--	--
Single-parent family		0.57***		0.75
Stepfamily		0.52***		0.90
Other family		0.42***		0.29**
Maternal Education				
Less than HS (ref.)	--	--	--	--
High School		1.11		1.31
Some College		1.23†		0.91
University and more		1.64***		1.31
Generational Status				
1st generation		1.76***		2.99*
2nd generation		1.34*		1.97†
3rd generation (ref.)	--	--	--	--
pseudo r-square	0.00582	0.02992	0.01514	0.04743

Note: † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 2m Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression Models Predicting Never Been Married by Wave 4 by Racial/Ethnic Group (weighted data, N=14,618 & n_{Asian}=1,037)

	N=14,618		N=1,037	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
White	(ref.)	(ref.)	--	--
Black	3.00***	2.94***	--	--
Hispanic	1.29*	1.34*	--	--
East Asian	2.25***	2.25***	(ref.)	(ref.)
Filipinos	1.85**	1.92**	0.84	0.93
Other Asians	1.14	1.18	0.51**	0.58*
Male	1.48***	1.48***	1.98***	2.04***
Age at Wave 4	0.79***	0.80***	0.73***	0.75***
Family Status				
Two-parent family (ref.)		--		--
Single-parent family		1.21**		0.69
Stepfamily		0.94		1.02
Other family		0.85		0.77
Maternal Education				
Less than HS (ref.)		--		--
High School		1.01		0.69
Some College		1.05		1.16
University and more		1.22†		1.2
Generational Status				
1st generation		0.82		0.36**
2nd generation		1.09		0.62†
3rd generation (ref.)		--		--
pseudo r-square	0.05683	0.05985	0.08509	0.11134

Note: † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

remain single (OR=0.58, $p<.05$) than East Asians, net of all socio-demographic controls and generational status. First-generation Asian Americans have a much lower chance of remaining unmarried than their third-generation peers (OR=0.36, $p<.01$). The finding supports hypothesis H2 that stated East Asian and Filipino Americans are less likely to be married during young adulthood than their South Asian counterparts.

(C) The Outcome of First Cohabitation

In Table 3c, East Asian and Filipino Americans are less likely to end their first cohabitation in marriage in the baseline model (OR=0.47, $p<.01$ and OR=0.68, $p<.05$, see models on the left). East Asians remain much less likely to marry after first cohabitation even after generational status is considered (OR=0.54, $p<.05$). This statistical significance remains when the race of partner is added to Model 3. On the right side of Table 3c, South Asians are more likely (OR=1.71, $p<.10$) to turn a first cohabitation into a marriage in the baseline model, but the effect disappeared when a set of covariates was added in Model 2. When the race of the partner is taken into account, Filipino Americans become more likely (OR=1.78, $p<.10$) to marry their first cohabiting partner than East Asians. One intriguing finding to be noted is that Asian Americans who cohabit with a white partner (OR=1.70, $p<.10$) are more likely to end up in marriage, compared to when the partner comes from other racial minority groups. These findings support hypothesis H3 that stated first cohabitation experienced by Filipino Americans are more likely to end in marriage than those of their East and South Asian peers.

(D) Premarital Cohabitation Before First Marriage

As presented in Table 3m (models in the left side), South Asians are significantly less likely than whites to have a first marriage preceded by cohabitation (OR=0.39, $p<.01$), but this

Table 3c Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression Models Predicting Marriage As an Outcome of First Cohabitation by Racial/Ethnic Group (weighted data, N=10,381 & n_{Asian}=617)

	N=10,381			N=617		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
White	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	--	--	--
Black	0.37***	0.38***	0.48***	--	--	--
Hispanic	0.74**	0.82	0.97	--	--	--
East Asian	0.47**	0.54*	0.59*	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Filipinos	0.68*	0.81	0.98	1.51	1.38	1.78†
South Asians	0.77	0.92	1.06	1.71†	1.34	1.43
Male	0.72***	0.73***	0.71***	0.47**	0.44**	0.42**
Age at Wave 4	1.24***	1.23***	1.23***	1.30**	1.32**	1.38**
Family Structure						
Two-parent family (ref.)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Single-parent family		0.81**	0.82**		2.91†	3.06†
Stepfamily		0.97	0.97		1.55†	1.59†
Other family		1.16	1.17		1.40	1.57
Maternal Education						
Less than HS (ref.)	--	--	--	--	--	--
High School		0.95	0.93		0.91	0.79
Some College		0.94	0.92		0.49	0.42†
University and more		0.89	0.86		0.50	0.40
Generational Status						
1st generation		0.84	0.88		1.94†	1.77
2nd generation		0.77*	0.79*		1.66	1.51
3rd generation (ref.)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Partner's Race						
White			1.40**			1.70†
Asian			1.02			0.51
Other (ref.)	--	--	--	--	--	--
pseudo r-square	0.04742	0.04994	0.05225	0.07268	0.13433	0.16510

Note: † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

The "other" category of partner's race refers to partners who are black, Hispanic, or other race.

variation is reduced to insignificance when socio-demographic covariates and generational status are considered in Model 2. However, once the race of the married partner is added to Model 4, the odds of Filipino Americans cohabiting with their partner prior to their first marriage are more than one time higher than whites. In general, the chance of pre-marital cohabitation is much lower (OR=0.63, $p<.10$) if the race of the first married partner is Asian rather than another minority group. When the sample is narrowed down to only Asian Americans, as shown in the right-hand-side models, Filipino Americans are significantly more likely (OR=3.38, $p<.01$) than East Asian Americans to engage in premarital cohabitation prior to their first marriages, holding all things constant. In particular, the likelihood of cohabiting before marriage is much higher when the partner is white (OR=2.88, $p<.05$) than when he/she comes from a minority group or is of Asian background (test between white and Asian partners not shown but significant). These findings support hypothesis H3 that stated first marriages formed by Filipino Americans are more likely to be preceded by cohabitation than those from East and South Asia.

(E) Race of Cohabiting Partner

The next set of models examines the variations in interracial partnering between Asian subgroups. As can be seen in Table 4c, Filipino Americans are much more likely than East Asians to cohabit with an Asian partner (OR=4.61, $p<.01$) or partners from other minority groups (OR=3.13, $p<.01$) than with a white partner. This pattern persists till Model 2 and becomes even more pronounced after socio-demographic covariates and generational status are considered (OR=3.56, $p<.01$ and OR=5.08, $p<.01$). South Asians are no more likely to cohabit with non-white partners than East Asians. Hypothesis H4 is partially supported because only East Asians are significantly more likely to have a white cohabiting partner, but not Filipino Americans.

Table 3m Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression Models Predicting First Marriage Being Preceded by Cohabitation by Racial/Ethnic Group (weighted data, N=7,319 & n_{Asian}=441)

	N=7,319			N=441		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
White	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	--	--	--
Black	0.77*	0.67**	0.69**	--	--	--
Hispanic	0.63***	0.85	0.86	--	--	--
East Asian	0.69	1.14	1.38	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Filipinos	0.86	1.73	2.40**	1.36	2.06+	3.38**
South Asians	0.39**	0.7	0.92	0.61	0.65	0.87
Male	1.11	1.12	1.12	0.51*	0.44**	0.48*
Age at Wave 4	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.98	1.06	1.1
Family Structure						
Two-parent family (ref.)		--			--	--
Single-parent family		1.40***	1.41***		3.43*	4.03*
Stepfamily		1.46***	1.45***		1.52	1.21
Other family		2.06***	2.05***		4.95**	6.53**
Maternal Education						
Less than HS (ref.)		--	--		--	--
High School		0.81†	0.81†		0.66	0.71
Some College		0.78†	0.79†		0.72	0.77
University and more		0.77*	0.77*		0.64	0.54
Generational Status						
1st generation		0.40***	0.41***		0.23**	0.29*
2nd generation		0.65**	0.65**		0.79	0.89
3rd generation (ref.)		--	--			--
Partner's Race						
White			1.04			2.88*
Asian			0.63†			0.65
Other (ref.)			--			--
pseudo r-square	0.00746	0.02187	0.02272	0.04095	0.14538	0.18829

Note: † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
 The "other" category of partner's race refers to partners who are black, Hispanic, or other race.

Table 4c Odds Ratios of Multinomial Logistic Regression Models Predicting the Race of First Cohabiting Partner (weighted data, n_{Asian}=617)

(ref: white partner)	Model 1		Model 2	
	Other	Asian	Other	Asian
East Asian (ref.)	--	--	--	--
Filipinos	3.13**	4.61**	3.56**	5.08**
South Asians	1.56	2.19	1.24	1.81
Male	1.59	1.73	1.5	1.83†
Age at Wave 4	1.34**	1.17	1.40**	1.20
Family Structure				
Two-parent family (ref.)			--	--
Single-parent family			1.20	1.07
Stepfamily			1.05	0.37
Other family			4.11	2.41
Maternal Education				
Less than HS (ref.)			--	--
High School			0.25*	0.51
Some College			0.21*	0.60
University and more			0.20*	0.24*
Generational Status				
1st generation			0.54	0.91
2nd generation			0.88	0.54
3rd generation (ref.)			--	--
pseudo r-square	0.00871		0.10919	

Note: † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

The “other” category in the outcome variable refers to partners who are black, Hispanic, or other race.

(F) Race of Married Partner

For the first marital event, both Filipinos and South Asian Americans are significantly more likely than East Asians to marry an Asian partner or a partner of other racial minority groups than to marry a white partner. Such a pattern is stronger among Filipinos than among South Asian Americans, as demonstrated in the odds ratios listed in Table 4m. Similar to the models presented previously for first cohabitation, this ethnic variations in partner's race/ethnicity remain robust even when socio-demographic covariates are added to Model 2. In particular, the odds of first-generation Asian Americans to marry other Asian coethnics than to marry a white partner are about five times higher (OR=6.04, $p < .10$) than third-generation Asian Americans. Comparing Tables 4c and 4m, the tendency to marry a non-white partner is much stronger in marital unions for both Filipinos and South Asians than in cohabiting unions, when the reference group is their East Asian counterparts. Hypothesis H4 is partially supported because only East Asians are significantly more likely to have a white married partner, but not Filipino Americans.

IV. Conclusions and Discussion

This study explores the understudied ethnic variations in first union characteristics among Asian American young adults. The findings show that the prevalence of ever having cohabited in young adulthood is much lower among Asian Americans than other racial groups. Very little ethnic variation is found across the three Asian subgroups examined in this study: East Asian, Filipino, and South Asian Americans. The findings show that it is nativity status that matters for the likelihood of cohabitation, rather than ethnic group membership. The odds of first-generation Asian Americans to have never cohabited are two times higher than their third-generation counterparts. Overall, the prevalence of cohabitation observed among the 25- to 32-year-old Asian American young adults here is

Table 4m Odds Ratios of Multinomial Logistic Regression Models Predicting the Race of First Married Partner (weighted data, $n_{\text{Asian}}=441$)

(ref: white partner)	Model 1		Model 2	
	Other	Asian	Other	Asian
East Asian (ref.)	--	--	--	--
Filipinos	6.03**	5.82***	7.07**	6.54**
South Asians	5.47***	3.53**	6.27**	3.69*
Male	1.06	1.62	1.06	1.86
Age at Wave 4	1.14	1.18	1.23	1.17
Family Structure				
Two-parent family (ref.)			--	--
Single-parent family			2.52	1.67
Stepfamily			1.75	0.31*
Other family			5.52†	2.71
Maternal Education				
Less than HS (ref.)			--	--
High School			1.07	2.78
Some College			1.39	3.38
University and more			0.45	0.91
Generational Status				
1st generation			1.37	6.04†
2nd generation			1.07	1.82
3rd generation (ref.)			--	--
pseudo r-square		0.01636		0.13989

Note: † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
 The “other” category in the outcome variable refers to partners who are black, Hispanic, or other race.

much higher than those reported by Liang and Ito (1999). The difference is likely due to the fact that their study dealt with Asian Americans born in the mid-1920s to 1970, while the current study analyzed individuals born in the mid-1970s to early 1980s. Figures in these two studies reveal a cohort shift toward higher rates of cohabitation among Asian American immigrants.

For first marriages, East Asian and Filipino Americans are significantly less likely than whites to have married in young adulthood. Across Asian ethnic groups, East Asian and Filipino Americans delay first marriages longer than South Asian Americans (comparison between Filipinos and South Asians not shown but marginally significant at .10 level). Results also highlight the importance of nativity status: the odds of first-generation Asian Americans to remain single in young adulthood are 64% lower when compared to the third-generation. This shows that as Asian Americans become more acculturated to the mainstream culture they are more likely to delay their marriages than those who just arrived in the U.S. Given that a smaller proportion of South Asian immigrants completed tertiary education, it is not surprising to find that more of them were already married in young adulthood. The results correspond to prior research showing how school enrolment among women is associated with delayed timing of first marriages (Brien & Lillard, 1994; Mensch, Singh, & Casterline, 2005). It also underscores the fact that ethnic variations should not be overlooked when studying Asian American union formation.

Regarding the outcomes of first cohabitation and first marriage, the odds of turning a first cohabitation into a marriage is nearly 80% higher for Filipino Americans than that of East Asian Americans. This is particularly true if the first cohabiting partner is white than when he/she is from other racial minority group. The pattern reveal here suggests that although Filipino Americans are not more likely to cohabit than the other two Asian subgroups, their cohabiting unions function more like a “trial marriage” and are more likely to lead to long-term marital relationships. Moreover, co-residential unions formed between Asian Americans

and whites are comparatively more stable relationships, as they more often lead to marriages. On the other hand, the odds of first marriages being preceded by cohabitation are more than two times higher for Filipinos than those of East Asians. Having a white partner significantly raises the risk of cohabitation prior to entering a first marriage. This finding is also indicative of Filipinos' higher level of acculturation in the American mainstream culture of growing premarital cohabitation.

Finally, for the race of cohabiting or married partners, Filipinos are more likely to cohabit with Asian coethnics or individuals from other minority groups than with whites, when compared with their East Asian peers. For the race/ethnicity of a married partner, East Asians are the group that has the highest likelihood of partnering with whites than their Filipino or South Asian counterparts. Given the significant influence of American culture on Philippine society during the first half of the twentieth century and the longer history of Filipino immigration to the U.S., one would think that Filipino Americans should have higher union formation rates with white Americans than the other two Asian subgroups. An earlier study that used the 1990 Census data showed that Filipino Americans have the largest share of the interracial marriages with whites among Asian Americans (Qian, Blair, & Ruf, 2001). The much higher rate of having white cohabiting and marital partners among East Asian Americans for this younger cohort of adults in the current study may signal a new trend and is an intriguing issue for future research to confirm with a larger analytical sample. The patterns show that while Filipino Americans appear to be more acculturated in terms of higher cohabitation rates prior to marriage and slower transition to first marriage than South Asians, they tend to partner more with other Asian coethnics and minority groups (i.e., African Americans or Hispanics) than their East Asian counterparts. In a way, they have a lower level of integration into mainstream culture by maintaining a further social distance from the majority group than East Asian immigrants. This

is true for both Filipino cohabiting and marital unions and is stronger in the latter form of relationships. Whether this pattern is due to geographic proximity (e.g., more Filipinos live in major immigrant destinations) or structural barriers would be an important topic for future research to address.

A number of study limitations should be noted. First of all, it would be more ideal if discrete-time event history analyses were used. However, data requirements are also more intense for event history analyses than regular logistic regression. That is, any variable that could be time-varying should have complete yearly/monthly records. For the current study, family structure should be time-varying, but it is not possible to know whether a respondent went through parental divorce or remarriage or re-partnering between Waves 1 and 4 (a time span of 12-14 years). In turn, a strong assumption of *no change* in family structure would need to be posed if event history analyses are to be used. This is not appropriate and hence logistic regression models were used instead. Secondly, finer ethnic categories could not be used due to the limited number of Asian American youths in the Add Health data. It is not ideal to group youths of Asian Indian and other South/Southeast Asian origins together, since the former often have parents with better socioeconomic profiles than the latter. This is largely due to the fact that the majority of post-1965 immigration from India is composed of students seeking advanced scientific studies in the U.S. (Sheth, 1995), while most of the South and Southeast Asian Americans entered the U.S. through the refugee resettlement program (Rumbaut, 1995). Lastly, substantial sample attrition took place between Waves 1 and 4 of Add Health that could potentially lead to some bias in estimations, which is a common data issue among longitudinal surveys.

In conclusion, this paper adds to the current literature on ethnic variations in union formation among Asian Americans in two ways. First, the data structure of Add Health offers a unique opportunity to investigate whether a first marriage is preceded by

cohabitation and the outcome of first cohabiting union across Asian ethnic groups. To the author’s knowledge, this issue has never been explored in any existing studies—a topic that cannot be looked at with the widely-used census data for examining ethnic differentials in union characteristics of Asian Americans. Second, the detailed information on cohabiting and marital partners collected in Add Health also facilitates the investigation of ethnic variations in inter-racial/ethnic partnering patterns of Asian Americans. This is also an unanswerable question in prior studies that utilized the census or American Community Surveys to study Asian American families. If interracial partnering with whites is an indicator of social distance between minority groups and the mainstream society, East Asian Americans appear to be the most integrated group among all Asian immigrants. Overall, the results here suggest the importance of new data collection efforts to incorporate large samples of Asian Americans that are representative of the diverse immigrant population in both generational and ethnic terms. A wider array of family characteristics and demographic indicators should also be included so that researchers can acquire a clearer picture of post-immigration adaptations for this fast-growing minority group in the United States.

References

- Barnes, J. S., & Bennett, C. E. (2002). *The Asian population: 2000 — Census 2000 brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Brien, M. J., & Lillard, L. A. (1994). Education, marriage, and first conception in Malaysia. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 29, 4: 1167-1204.
- Casper, L. M., & Bianchi, S. M. (2002). *Continuity and change in the American family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crissey, S. R. (2005). Race/ethnic differences in the marital expectations of adolescents: The role of romantic relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 3: 697-709.
- East-West Center. (2002). Tradition and change in marriage and family life. In *The future of population in Asia* (pp. 29-39). Honolulu, HI: East-West Center.
- Foner, N. (1997). The immigrant family: Cultural legacies and cultural changes. *International Migration Review*, 31, 4: 961-974.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, K. M., Florey, F., Tabor, J., Bearman, P. S., Jones, J., & Udry, J. R. (2003). *The national longitudinal study of adolescent health: Research design*. Retrieved from <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design>
- Hoeffel, E. M., Rastogi, S., Kim, M.-O., & Shahid, H. (2012). *The Asian population: 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf>
- Jones, G. W. (2005). The “flight from marriage” in South-east and East Asia. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 36, 1: 93-119.
- Jones, G. W., & Gubhaju, B. (2009). Factors influencing changes in mean age at first marriage and proportions never marrying in the low-fertility countries of East and Southeast Asia. *Asian Population Studies*, 5, 3: 237-265.
- Jones, G. W., Straughan, P. T., & Chan, A. (2009). *Ultra-low fertility in Pacific Asia: Trends, causes and policy issues*. New York: Routledge.

- Kalmijn, M., & van Tubergen, F. (2010). A comparative perspective on intermarriage: Explaining differences among national-origin groups in the United States. *Demography*, 47, 2: 459-479. doi: 10.1353/dem.0.0103
- Lee, J., & Zhou, M. (Eds.) (2004). *Asian American youth: Culture, identity, and ethnicity*. New York: Routledge.
- Lehrer, E. L., & Chiswick, C. U. (1993). Religion as a determinant of marital stability. *Demography*, 30, 3: 385-404.
- Lesthaeghe, R. (2010). The unfolding story of the second demographic transition. *Population and Development Review*, 36, 2: 211-251.
- Lesthaeghe, R., & van de Kaa, D. J. (1986). Twee demografische transitie. In R. Lesthaeghe & D. J. van de Kaa (Eds.), *Bevolking: Groei en krimp, mens en maatschappij book supplement* (pp. 9-24). Deventer, the Netherlands: Van Loghum-Slaterus.
- Liang, Z., & Ito, N. (1999). Intermarriage of Asian Americans in the New York City region: Contemporary patterns and future prospects. *International Migration Review*, 33, 4: 876-900.
- Liebertson, S., & Waters, M. C. (1988). *From many strands: Ethnic and racial groups in contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Manning, W. D., & Landale, N. S. (1996). Racial and ethnic differences in the role of cohabitation in premarital childbearing. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 58, 1: 63-77.
- Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1995). Why marry? Race and the transition to marriage among cohabitators. *Demography*, 32, 4: 509-520.
- Martin, P. L., & Midgley, E. (2003). *Immigration: Shaping and reshaping America* (Vol. 58). Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.
- McLoyd, V. C., Cauce, A. M., Takeuchi, D., & Wilson, L. (2000). Marital processes and parental socialization in families of color: A decade review of research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 4: 1070-1093.
- Mensch, B. S., Singh, S., & Casterline, J. B. (2005). *Trends in the*

- timing of first marriage among men and women in the developing world* (Policy Research Division Working Papers No. 202). New York: Population Council.
- Michael, R. T., & Tuma, N. B. (1985). Entry into marriage and parenthood by young men and women: The influence of family background. *Demography*, 22, 4: 515-544.
- Min, P. G., & Kim, C. (2009). Patterns of intermarriages and cross-generational in-marriages among native-born Asian Americans. *International Migration Review*, 43, 3: 447-470. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00773.x
- Philippine Statistics Authority. (2016). *Live births in the Philippines: 2014*. Retrieved from <https://psa.gov.ph/content/live-births-philippines-2014>
- Qian, Z. (1997). Breaking the racial barriers: Variations in interracial marriage between 1980 and 1990. *Demography*, 34, 2: 263-276.
- Qian, Z., Blair, S. L., & Ruf, S. D. (2001). Asian American interracial and interethnic marriages: Differences by education and nativity. *International Migration Review*, 35, 2: 557-586.
- Raymo, J. M., Iwasawa, M., & Bumpass, L. (2009). Cohabitation and family formation in Japan. *Demography*, 46, 4: 785-803.
- Reeves, T. J., & Bennett, C. E. (2004). *We the people: Asians in the United States* (CENSR-17). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (1995). Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian Americans. In P. G. Min (Ed.), *Asian Americans: Contemporary trends and issues* (pp. 232-270). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schoen, R., & Cheng, Y.-h. A. (2006). Partner choice and the differential retreat from marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 1: 1-10.
- Schoen, R., Landale, N. S., & Daniels, K. (2007). Family transitions in young adulthood. *Demography*, 44, 4: 807-820.
- Schoen, R., Landale, N. S., Daniels, K., & Cheng, Y.-h. A. (2009). Social background differences in early family behavior. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 2: 384-395.
- Sheth, M. (1995). Asian Indian Americans. In P. G. Min (Ed.), *Asian*

- Americans: Contemporary trends and issues* (pp. 169-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Staples, R., & Mirande, A. (1980). Racial and cultural variations among American families: A decennial review of the literature on minority families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 42, 4: 887-903.
- Williams, L., & Guest, M. P. (2005). Attitudes toward marriage among the urban middle-class in Vietnam, Thailand, and the Philippines. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 36, 2: 163-186.
- Williams, L., Kabamalan, M., & Ogena, N. (2007). Cohabitation in the Philippines: Attitudes and behaviors among young women and men. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 5: 1244-1256.
- Xie, Y., & Goyette, K. A. (2004). *The American people, census 2000: A demographic portrait of Asian Americans*. Washington, DC: Russell Sage Foundation and Population Reference Bureau.
- Zhou, M. (2007). Divergent origins and destinies: Children of Asian immigrants. In S. J. Paik & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Narrowing the achievement gap: Strategies for educating Latino, black, and Asian students* (pp. 109-128). New York: Springer.
- Zhou, M., & Lee, J. (2004). Introduction: The making of culture, identity, and ethnicity among Asian American youth. In J. Lee & M. Zhou (Eds.), *Asian American youth: Culture, identity, and ethnicity* (pp. 1-30). New York: Routledge.
- Zhou, M., & Xiong, Y. S. (2005). The multifaceted American experiences of the children of Asian immigrants: Lessons for segmented assimilation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28, 6: 1119-1152.

亞裔美籍青年初婚與首次同居的族群差異

鄭雁馨

中央研究院社會學研究所
11529 臺北市研究院路二段 128 號
Email: aliceyh@gate.sinica.edu.tw

摘 要

本研究探討亞裔美籍青年初婚與首次同居的特徵，並聚焦於不同族群如東亞裔、菲律賓裔、與南亞裔的美籍青年之間的差異。本研究運用第四波的美國青少年健康長期追蹤資料庫 (National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, Add Health) 作為資料來源。本波資料收集了在 2007-2008 年間 25-32 歲的所有受訪者完整的親密關係與婚姻資訊 (union histories)，這為研究青年移民的初婚與首次同居經驗提供了絕佳的研究素材。研究發現顯示，在考慮了社會人口特徵之後，同居經驗的普及率在各族群間相當類似。就婚姻而言，東亞裔與菲律賓裔的美籍青年較南亞裔青年更容易延遲結婚。菲律賓裔青年較其他兩族群青年有更高比例將首次同居關係轉為婚姻，也有更高比例在婚前同居。而就親密伴侶而言，東亞裔青年有更高比例會與白人同居或是結婚。與東亞裔青年相比，菲律賓裔青年則較容易與其他亞裔青年或是其他少數族群同居，而不是與白人同居。本研究的發現顯示族群差異在研究亞裔美籍青年的同居或結婚是一個重要且不可忽視的變項，反映亞裔族群整體的多元性與在家庭行為上的差異。

關鍵詞：亞裔美國人、種族／族群、結婚、通婚、同居