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Introduction / Background

This poster examines the geographic distribution of interracial and interethnic married couples in the United States.* The analysis focuses on county level distributions that map the prevalence of specific combinations of interracial / interethnic married couples, such as Whites married to Asians. The county maps illustrate the diversity of interracial / interethnic couple combinations around the country.

Much of the literature on interracial or interethnic married couples shows all such couples together. However, particular intermarried combinations have distinct histories and distributions across the United States. Given distinct paths of entry into the United States, internal migration patterns, and residential segregation, we would expect that White / Black** couples may tend to live in different areas than White / Asian couples, for example. Couples with a relatively longer history of intermarriage, such as Hispanic / non-Hispanic couples or White / American Indian and Alaska Native couples may have distinct patterns of residence. This poster provides basic information about where particular intermarried couples live, by county, across the United States.

*If either spouse was not in the same single race as the other spouse, or if at least one spouse was in a multiple-race group, then the couple was classified as an interracial couple. If one spouse was Hispanic and the other was non-Hispanic, then the couple was classified as an interethnic couple.

**Race couple combinations (e.g. White / Black) will be used when discussing interracial couple combinations in general or when referencing literature. Race couple combinations will include the terms Non-Hispanic / Hispanic (e.g. Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Black) when referencing all tables, charts, and figures in this poster.
Data Source

The 2010 Census provides a large and robust data source to look at the distribution of interracial / interethnic combinations of married couples across the United States.

Given the immense size of the 2010 data sets, it is possible to map the prevalence of particular combinations of interracial / interethnic married couples. The decennial census asked only about the relationship of each household member to the householder (one who owns or rents the housing unit). So we can only show married couples that include the householder. Based on American Community Survey estimates for 2010, we are likely including about 97 percent of all married couples (Source: Internal Census Bureau Tabulation, 2010 American Community Survey).
In 2010, there were 5.4 million interracial or interethnic married couple households. These couples were 9.5 percent of all married couple households. This was an increase from 2000, when 7.4 percent of married couple households were interracial or interethnic. Of the 64 possible combinations, this poster considers intermarried combinations for groups that comprise at least 5 percent of all interracial or interethnic couples nationwide as shown in Table 1.

The 7 groups shown in this poster account for 94 percent of all the intermarried couple households. Tables detailing husband’s race / origin by wife’s race / origin can be accessed at: http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2010/briefs/cph-t-4.html
Table 1. Married Couple Households in the United States: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Couple</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total married couple households</strong></td>
<td>56,510,377</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total same race or same Hispanic origin couples</td>
<td>51,141,342</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interracial / interethnic couples</td>
<td>5,369,035</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total interracial / interethnic couples</strong></td>
<td>5,369,035</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Combinations Shown in Poster</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White / Hispanic (any race)</td>
<td>2,020,825</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>422,250</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN)</td>
<td>280,780</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Asian</td>
<td>737,493</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One reported multiple races (both Hispanic or both non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>838,190</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both reported multiple races (both Hispanic or both non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>341,255</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Non-Hispanic (excluding Non-Hispanic White)</td>
<td>390,650</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Combinations Not Shown in Poster</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (NHPI)</td>
<td>33,242</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Some Other Race (SOR)</td>
<td>29,385</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both reported a single race, neither is White, both Hispanic or both non-Hispanic</td>
<td>108,994</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both reported Hispanic, one White, the other is another single race</td>
<td>165,971</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census
Factors Affecting Residence Patterns of Intermarried Couples

This poster provides county level maps of the percent of married couple households by county, for specific intermarried combinations. Factors affecting the residence patterns shown in the maps include:

1. Opportunity for potential spouses to meet: in areas where there are few Asians, for example, we would expect to see fewer White / Asian intermarried households (Harris & Ono 2004).

2. Historic patterns of residence / migration patterns: for example, the removal of many American Indian tribes from their original lands to reservation lands; historically higher proportions of Hispanics living in the Southwest; historically higher proportions of Asians living in the West.

3. Characteristics of the current population that are typical of those who are more likely to intermarry: for example, individuals with higher educational attainment are more likely to intermarry, so one might expect that areas with higher educational levels might have more intermarried couple households (Qian & Lichter 2007; Fryer 2007).
*Note to reviewers:* The title, “Interracial / Interethnic Married Couple Households as a Percent of all Married Couples Households by County” will serve as a heading title to encompass all maps and charts. In addition, intermarriage combinations will be headings that encompass the maps. The bar charts will have the titles as seen in this powerpoint presentation.

This legend will be displayed once to the left of all maps so that we will not need to repeat the legend on each map. Currently, the legend has been left on each map for ease of review.

*Not applicable – County contains fewer than 50 married couple households.*

(Not shown in legend: Two counties contain fewer than 50 married couple households, Loving, TX and Kalawao, HI.)
Non-Hispanic White / Hispanic (any race)

U.S. percent = 3.6 percent
Top Five Counties with the Highest Proportion of Non-Hispanic White / Hispanic (any race) Married Couple Households as a Percent of All Married Couple Households: 2010

Source: 2010 Census
Non-Hispanic White / Hispanic (any race)

Although rates of Hispanics marrying non-Hispanics have declined since the 1990s (Lichter, et al 2011) due in part to increasing residential segregation (Lichter, et al 2007), Hispanics and non-Hispanics have a long history of intermarriage in the southwestern part of the United States. Although some states in the West had laws against intermarriage, Hispanics were not mentioned (Pascoe 1991; Fryer 2007). In these areas, large Hispanic communities predated their incorporation as part of the United States. Given that most of the counties with the highest proportion of the population who is Hispanic are located in the western states (Ennis, et al 2011), it is no surprise that the highest proportions of non-Hispanic White / Hispanic (any race) married couple households are concentrated in counties in the West, including the top five highest proportions located in counties in Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado.
Top Five Counties with the Highest Proportion of Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Black Married Couple Households as a Percent of All Married Couple Households: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geary, KS</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty, GA</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche, OK</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, TX</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coryell, TX</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census
Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Black

White / Black intermarriage has a unique history in the United States. Since many African Americans entered the United States through the slave trade, marriage patterns between the two groups were heavily influenced by racism and slavery as an institution for hundreds of years. The first of many laws prohibiting White / Black marriage was passed in the colony of Maryland in 1661 (Cumminos 1963). It was not until 1967 that the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional for a state to have laws banning interracial marriage. At that time, 16 states still had laws prohibiting interracial marriage (Fryer 2007). Despite high concentrations of the Black population in counties throughout the South (Rastogi, et al 2011), high proportions of non-Hispanic White / non-Hispanic Black married couple households are primarily concentrated in counties in Virginia, Maryland, as well as the District of Columbia. The top five highest proportions are located in counties in Kansas, Georgia, Texas and Oklahoma that are in or near a military installation. Intermarriage is higher among service members (Farley 1999). Two aspects of the military may contribute to higher intermarriage among its members: Blacks are overrepresented among service members; and serving in the armed services tends to break down racial barriers (Kelty, et al 2010).
Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native

U. S. percent = 0.5 percent

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census
Top Five Counties with the Highest Proportion of Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native Married Couple Households as a Percent of All Married Couple Households: 2010

- Cherokee, OK: 23.5%
- Adair, OK: 22.8%
- Yakutat, AK: 22.5%
- Craig, OK: 20.8%
- Nowata, OK: 19.5%

Source: 2010 Census
Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native

Mention of American Indians in laws prohibiting marriage with Whites was inconsistent in states that had laws against intermarriage (Pascoe 1991; Fryer 2007). There were actually some laws promoting marriage between Whites and American Indians (Sandefur & McKinnell 1986). Since the time Spanish and French trappers and explorers interacted with American Indian tribes, there has been intermarriage, spanning hundreds of years (since the late 1400s) prior to the formation of the United States. Counties with higher proportions of non-Hispanic White / non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) married couple households are usually located in areas where the AIAN population is concentrated. The AIAN population was highly concentrated in counties in Oklahoma, the upper Midwest, the four corners of the Southwest, and Alaska (Norris, et al 2012). Counties with the top five highest proportions are located in Oklahoma and Alaska, and overlap with American Indian areas and Alaska Native village statistical areas. Oklahoma contains many AIAN areas since the Indian Removal Act of 1830 forced tribes from their traditional homelands in the eastern United States to reservation lands, many of which were in Oklahoma.
Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Asian

U.S. percent = 1.3 percent
Top Five Counties with the Highest Proportion of Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Asian Married Couple Households as a Percent of All Married Couple Households: 2010

![Bar chart showing the top five counties with the highest proportion of non-Hispanic white/non-Hispanic Asian married couple households as a percent of all married couple households in 2010. Honolulu, HI has the highest proportion at 8.6%, followed by Kauai, HI at 8.3%, Hawaii, HI at 7.5%, Maui, HI at 7.4%, and San Francisco, CA at 6.4%.

Source: 2010 Census]
Non-Hispanic White / Non-Hispanic Asian

Residence patterns of White / Asian couples appear to mirror residence patterns of Asians in the United States. In general terms, the pattern seen in this map mirrors the map showing Asian as a percentage of county population (Hoeffel, et al. 2012). The highest proportions of non-Hispanic White / non-Hispanic Asian married couple households are concentrated in counties in Hawaii and California. Hawaii has a long history of intermarriage among many different groups. Researchers have long studied intermarriage in Hawaii since the prevalence there has historically been much higher than in the continental United States (Monahan 1966; Parkman & Sawyer 1967; Schwertfeger 1982; Ho and Johnson 1990; Fu & Heaton 2000).
One Spouse Reported Multiple Races (both Hispanic or both non-Hispanic)

U.S. percent = 1.5 percent

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census
Top Five Counties with the Highest Proportion of Married Couple Households Where One Spouse Reported Multiple Races as a Percent of All Married Couple Households: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii, HI</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai, HI</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui, HI</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake and Peninsula, AK</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census
One Spouse Reported Multiple Races

High proportions of married couple households are concentrated in counties in Hawaii, Oklahoma and Alaska. The top five highest proportions are located in counties in Hawaii and Alaska. This is related to the fact that two of the most common multiple race groups reported are White / AIAN and White / Asian (Jones and Bullock 2012). Given that non-Hispanic White / non-Hispanic AIAN and non-Hispanic White / non-Hispanic Asian intermarriage are also among the more frequent combinations, it makes sense that we see higher proportions of couples that include a spouse who marked more than one race in Oklahoma, Hawaii, and Alaska, where AIAN or Asian populations are higher. Although White / Black is the most common multiple race group reported for the population overall, the prevalence of White / Black intermarriage is relatively low compared to the other groups, so that this map is dominated by couples where the multiracial spouse reported a combination that included AIAN or Asian.
Both Spouses Reported Multiple Races
(both Hispanic or both Non-Hispanic)

U.S. percent = 0.6 percent
Top Five Counties with the Highest Proportion of Married Couple Households Where Both Spouses Reported Multiple Races as a Percent of All Married Couple Households: 2010

- Hawaii, HI: 8.9%
- Bristol Bay, AK: 7.6%
- Maui, HI: 7.0%
- Kauai, HI: 6.6%
- Honolulu, HI: 5.8%

Source: 2010 Census
Both Spouses Reported Multiple Races

Although overall a relatively low proportion of married couple households include couples where both spouses reported being multiracial, we again see, as in the map of couples with one multiracial spouse, that areas where these couples live are those that have higher proportions of Asians or AIAN. The top five highest proportions of couples where both reported multiple races are located in counties in Hawaii and Alaska.
Hispanic / Non-Hispanic (excluding Non-Hispanic White)

U.S. percent = 0.7 percent
Top Five Counties with the Highest Proportion of Hispanic / Non-Hispanic (excluding Non-Hispanic White) Married Couple Households as a Percent of All Married Couple Households: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii, HI</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai, HI</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui, HI</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley, NM</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census
Hispanic / Non-Hispanic (excluding Non-Hispanic White)

Similarly to the non-Hispanic White / Hispanic couples map, these couples often live in the West. The highest proportions for these couples are in counties in Hawaii and New Mexico, including the top five highest proportions in counties in Hawaii and New Mexico.
Top Five Counties with the Highest Proportion of Interracial / Interethnic Married Couple Households as a Percent of All Married Couple Households: 2010

*Note to reviewer: This is the title for the next two slides.
Kauai, HI
- 8.3
- 12.9
- 6.6
- 5.4

Honolulu, HI
- 8.6
- 12.0
- 5.8
- 4.7

Maui, HI
- 7.4
- 12.3
- 7.0
- 4.7

Hawaii, HI
- 7.5
- 14.3
- 8.9
- 5.9

Source: 2010 Census
Conclusions / Implications

County level maps showing the percentage of all married couple households that involve particular intermarried combinations demonstrate the distinctive residential patterns of racial groups in the United States, as well as reflecting the connection to the particular histories of race and ethnic groups in the United States.

The majority of interracial / interethnic married couple households are located in counties in the West with the exception of non-Hispanic White / non-Hispanic Black married couple households (Qian, Z., and Lichter, D.T. 2011; Wang, W. 2012).
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