

CONSEQUENCES OF RACIAL INTERMARRIAGE FOR CHILDREN'S SOCIAL INTEGRATION

MATTHIJS KALMIJN
Tilburg University

ABSTRACT: *Much has been written on ethnic and racial intermarriage, but little research is available on the social consequences of intermarriage. Are the children of mixed marriages more strongly connected to the majority, or are they incorporated in the ethnic or racial minority group? To answer this question, this article uses a minority survey from the Netherlands with data collected from both parents and children. The focus is on Antilleans and Surinamese and children of marriages in which both spouses are black are compared to children of marriages in which one spouse is white and one spouse is black. The analyses provide strong support for the integrative effects of intermarriage on children. These effects are not conditional on the socioeconomic status of the parents. Moreover, the effect on children can be explained in terms of the more diverse meeting opportunities that parents in a mixed marriage provide to their children.*

Keywords: intermarriage, ethnicity, family

Intermarriage has long been considered a core indicator of the integration of ethnic and racial minorities in society (Kalmijn 1998; Qian and Lichter 2007; Schermerhorn 1970). The most important reason for this is that when members of ethnic and racial groups marry with other groups, this is a sign that these groups accept each other as equals. Intermarriage is also considered important, however, for its potential consequences. Intermarriage may reduce group identities and prejudice in future generations because the children of mixed marriages are less likely to identify themselves with a single group (Saenz, Hwang, and Anderson 1995; Xie and Goyette 1997). In addition, the children of mixed marriages are believed to interact more frequently across group boundaries and they tend to choose a marriage partner from the majority more often (Okun 2004). Finally, high rates of intermarriage make it more difficult to define who is belonging to an ethnic or racial group and this by itself could also weaken the salience of ethnic and racial boundaries in society (Davis 1991). In short, ethnic and racial intermarriages are not only considered a reflection of integration in society, they may also contribute to integration.

Address correspondence to: Matthijs Kalmijn, P.O. Box 90153, Tilburg 5000LE, the Netherlands; e-mail: m.kalmijn@uvt.nl.

Sociological Perspectives, Vol. 53, Issue 2, pp. 271–286, ISSN 0731-1214, electronic ISSN 1533-8673.
© 2010 by Pacific Sociological Association. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website, at <http://www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintinfo.asp>. DOI: 10.1525/sop.2010.53.2.271.

Quite a lot has been written on patterns and trends in ethnic and racial intermarriage in the United States (Jacobs and Labov 2002; Kalmijn 1993; Qian, Blair, and Ruf 2001; Qian and Lichter 2007), in Europe (Gonzalez-Ferrer 2006; Kalmijn and Van Tubergen 2006; Klein 2001; Monden and Smits 2005), and in other parts of the developed world (Jones and Luijkx 1996; Kalbach 2002; Okun 2001; Roy and Hamilton 2000). Much less research has been done on the consequences of intermarriage. The studies that do examine consequences of intermarriage have been mostly concerned with the development of ethnic and racial identities (Finns and O'Leary 2003; Lee and Bean 2004; Liebler 2004; Qian 2004; Saenz et al. 1995; Xie and Goyette 1997). Consequences of intermarriage for social aspects of integration have rarely been studied, despite the fact that the integrative function of intermarriage has almost become a textbook assertion. An exception is a study by Stephan and Stephan, who find that Asian American and Hispanic American students do not have more contact with (non-Hispanic) whites when they have one white parent (Stephan and Stephan 1989; Stephan and Stephan 1991). Although not representative of the entire population, these findings suggest that mixed race or ethnicity does not always have a positive effect on integration.

One reason why few studies have examined the effects of intermarriage on integration is that few good data sets are available to analyze the problem. Ethnic and racial minority groups are relatively small in most Western countries and intermarriage is not so common. Hence, large data sets with oversamples of minority groups are needed to analyze the effects of intermarriage. Few such data sets exist. In this article, we present a new analysis of the problem using pooled data from three nationally representative minority surveys in the Netherlands. We focus on two interesting black minority groups in the Netherlands: the Antilleans and the Creole Surinamese.

Our main hypothesis is that the children of marriages between a black and a white spouse are more strongly connected with the white majority in a society than the children of marriages in which both spouses are black (Okun 2004; Saenz et al. 1995; Stephan and Stephan 1991; Xie and Goyette 1997). In the literature, several reasons can be found for expecting this, but authors have also suggested reasons for expecting a modest or even no effect at all (Cauce, Hiraga, Mason, Aguilar, Ordonez, and Gonzalez 1992; Root 1992; Saenz et al. 1995).

First, children in mixed marriages may be more integrated because mixed couples have a weaker orientation toward the minority group than the (average) minority parent in a non-mixed marriage. Through the process of socialization, the children in a mixed marriage may therefore develop a weaker attachment to their ethnic origin or racial group (Alba 1990; Cauce et al. 1992). Related to this is that minority parents who are in a mixed marriage tend to be more highly educated on average (Hwang, Saenz, and Aguirre 1995; Van Tubergen and Maas 2007). A higher education is also associated with a weaker sense of identification with the group and less emphasis on ascribed group boundaries (Kalmijn 1998).

Second, children of mixed marriages can be more integrated because mixed couples are more strongly connected to the majority group. Assuming that both spouses bring their own network to the social life of their marriage, it is plausible that part of the network of a mixed couple will be white. Although it is possible

that a mixed couple leans more toward the original network of the black spouse, on average, mixed couples will have more whites in their network than couples in which both spouses are black. Mixed couples may also live in less segregated neighborhoods than non-mixed couples, which will also be a source of integration. Because the networks and contacts that the parents have provide important meeting opportunities for their children (Kalmijn and Flap 2001; Marsden 1990), the integration of the parents may be a reason why the children of mixed marriages are more integrated.

Third, there are strong norms against ethnic and racial intermarriage. These norms stem from the fear that intermarriage weakens intergenerational solidarity and that intermarriage indirectly threatens the cohesion of the group (Kalmijn 1998). Obviously, the parents are already in a mixed marriage so they themselves will probably not adhere to such norms. However, the families and networks to which the parents belong may have different opinions and interests. These third parties to the marriage may have opposed the marriage and may sanction the couple when their opposition turned out to be unsuccessful (Bratter and Eschbach 2006). One way of sanctioning is by avoiding contact with the couple and the children who are born to the couple. If one assumes that norms against black-white intermarriage are stronger among whites, such sanctions would reduce or even eliminate the positive effect of mixed race on integration. Some authors have also argued, however, that both the white and the black group may sanction the couple (Cauce et al. 1992). In this case there will be an effect on isolation in general and not so much on the relative degree of integration.

Fourth, the role of the wider society is also relevant in this effect. Due to the fact that many children of black-white mixed race have dark skin, the children will be socially defined as black (Root 1992). This would then limit their being accepted by the majority group, in addition to the sanctions that families and networks of the spouses may apply. However, because the labels of black and white are less clear in the Netherlands (see below) and because there is also not a clear "one drop rule" as it exists in the United States (Davis 1991), we expect that the effect of black-white intermarriage would be more positive in the Netherlands than it would be in the United States.

In this article, we test the first two explanations. Our hypothesis is that a large part of the difference in integration between children of mixed and non-mixed race can be attributed to (a) the socialization characteristics of parents and (b) the contact opportunities that parents provide.

An additional hypothesis that we test concerns the role of socioeconomic status. It has been argued that being of mixed race or ethnicity has more impact on children of minority groups when this is combined with high socioeconomic status (Saenz et al. 1995). A possible reason for this is that the distance from the majority is reduced when a person has a high status, which in turn may lead to more acceptance by members of the majority. In other words, a mixed marriage may be more accepted among higher socioeconomic strata and this may make it easier for the children of mixed marriages to integrate. Since blacks on average have a lower socioeconomic status in the Netherlands than whites (Dagevos, Gijsberts, and Van Praag 2003; Van Niekerk 2000), children of mixed marriages who come

from high-status families may also experience more distance from their own minority group. This too could lead to more integration. In sum, we would expect a positive interaction effect of mixed race and parental socioeconomic status on children's integration.

There is little research on this last hypothesis when integration is the outcome variable. For identity formation of ethnic groups, the reverse effect has been found—higher educated children of mixed ethnicity appear *more* likely to identify themselves with the minority group (Xie and Goyette 1997). A possible reason is that higher educated children of ethnically mixed marriages come into contact with the white majority more often, which would heighten their sense of being different (Xie and Goyette 1997). How the interaction between socioeconomic status and mixed ethnicity or race turns out for contact measures is not yet known. We note, however, that our hypothesis of a positive interaction effect for mixed race and socioeconomic status is not necessarily in conflict with the results Xie and Goyette found for identity. After all, it is possible that integration into the majority population goes hand in hand with a strong ethnic or racial identification.

THE POSITION OF BLACKS IN THE NETHERLANDS

Before we turn to the data, it is important to give more background on the group and the national context in which it is embedded. The Netherlands is a young immigrant society. Most immigrants come from a selected number of countries: Turkey (1.9 percent), Morocco (1.7 percent), Indonesia (2.6 percent), Suriname (1.9 percent), and the Dutch Antilles (0.7 percent).¹ Moroccans and Turks were initially recruited as labor immigrants during the 1960s and 1970s. Both groups did not speak Dutch when they immigrated and both were mostly Islamic. Indonesians came to the Netherlands in various periods after the end of World War II, a period in which Indonesia, a former colony of the Netherlands, gained independence. Caribbeans came from Suriname and the Dutch Antilles. Both are former colonies of the Netherlands. Suriname is an independent country now and the Dutch Antilles is part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Caribbeans began migrating to the Netherlands after World War II. Most Caribbean immigrants were partly familiar with Dutch society and virtually all of them spoke Dutch as a second language before they immigrated.

Although there is a similarity between Dutch Caribbeans, on the one hand, and African Americans and black Caribbeans in the United Kingdom and the United States, on the other hand (Model, Fisher, and Silberman 1999), the ethnic and racial context in the Netherlands is different from that in the United States. First of all, in the Netherlands, the issue of race coincides with the issue of immigration. Virtually all Caribbeans are of the first or second generation, whereas most American blacks have been in the United States for many generations (Lieberson 1980). In this sense, the question of whether the children of mixed marriages are accepted in society is dependent not only on racial prejudice but also on attitudes towards immigrants. Attitudes toward immigrants in the Netherlands are generally negative, although this fluctuates in response to changes in the level of immigration, the type of immigration, and economic conditions in the Netherlands (Coenders,

Lubbers, Scheepers, and Verkuyten 2008). In the period we are considering (1994–2002), attitudes were starting to become more negative, but this probably applies more to Islamic immigrants than to immigrants from the Caribbean. Note also that the stereotypical idea that the Dutch are tolerant is not validated in research. In terms of attitudes toward non-Western immigrants, the Dutch are as negative as the average European (Scheepers, Gijsberts, and Coenders 2002).

Second, the concept of race seems less clearly defined in the Netherlands than in other countries. For example, the words “black” and “white” are not often used in day-to-day language (Essed and Trienekens 2007) and population surveys do not include questions on race or skin color. Instead of using the concept of race, the Dutch are more inclined to use the concept of ethnicity, where the Surinamese and Antilleans are regarded as “ethnic minority groups,” similar to the Moroccans and the Turks. Although some argue that there is discrimination against Caribbeans in the Netherlands (Bovenkerk 1978), it is not so clear whether race is the basis for this. Research shows that attitudes toward Turks and Moroccans are more negative than attitudes toward the Caribbean groups (Verkuyten and Kinket 2000; Verkuyten and Thijs 2002), something which was already true before the more recent increase in hostility toward Islamic groups began. Also interesting to observe is that the Antilleans and Creole Surinamese often marry outside their group, in contrast to the experience of African Americans in the United States and also in contrast to the Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands. About half of the Antillean men and 27 percent of the Creole Surinamese men are married to a white person, which is considerably more than in the United States (Kalmijn and Van Tubergen 2006).

Although the use of the term “ethnic” is common, these labels remain closely tied to national identities (Koopmans 2006). One important example of this lies in the Surinamese. The Surinamese are considered an “ethnic minority,” but they in fact consist of several different ethnic or racial subgroups. The Creole Surinamese—which are analyzed here—are descendants of slaves, the Hindustani are descendants of contract workers from British India, and the Javanese are descendants of contract workers from Indonesia (Choenni and Harmsen 2007). These groups have a different migration history to Suriname, a different pattern of language usage, a different ethnic identity and attachment to Suriname, and for a long period, also a different socioeconomic position (St-Hilaire 2001; Van Niekerk 2000). Moreover, the Creoles are black while the two other groups are more comparable to Asians. In the Netherlands, these diverse subgroups are often perceived as a single “immigrant” or “ethnic” group, which further reduces the salience of the label “black” in society. In many surveys, there is no distinction made between these ethnic identities and only the Surinamese label is used, either in terms of origin country or in terms of self-proclaimed group membership.

DATA AND METHODS

We use data from the survey “Socio-Economic Position and Welfare Use of Immigrants and Natives” (SPVA). The survey is held periodically among the four largest immigrant groups in the Netherlands: the Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, and

Antilleans. Sample sizes were 3,034 in 1994, 6,021 in 1998, and 4,017 in 2002. The sample size was about equally divided across the four minority groups. People in cities were overrepresented in the sample frame since most members of ethnic minorities live in cities. The sample frame consists of ten to thirteen municipalities (depending on the survey year). About 50 percent of the four immigrant groups in the Netherlands live in these thirteen municipalities. Data were collected by means of personal interviewers. Interviewers were fluent in the minority language and survey instruments were translated. The overall response rate for the minority groups was about 60 percent. In the Netherlands, the SPVA is the most authoritative source of information for policy debates and policy development on immigrants and integration. Researchers have used the SPVA to study a variety of aspects of immigrant integration, such as intermarriage (Kalmijn and Van Tubergen 2006), Dutch language acquisition (Van Tubergen and Kalmijn 2009), differences in schooling and socioeconomic status (Dagevos et al. 2003), and norms and values (Uunk 2003).

We combine three waves of the survey (1994, 1998, and 2002) in order to have sufficient numbers of children in mixed marriages. For our analysis, we select Surinamese and Antillean respondents. These are defined as persons born in these countries or persons whose parents were born there. Of the Surinamese, we only included respondents who identified themselves as Creole. This was based on a separate question in which the Surinamese were asked whether or not they identified themselves with particular subgroups.² We further select respondents who were living with a spouse and had a child living at home (of age 12 and over, see below).

The goal of the article is to compare children of mixed and non-mixed marriages (marriages include cohabiting couples). Non-mixed marriages are defined as Antillean or Creole Surinamese respondents who are living with a black partner—that is, someone who is born in the Antilles or Suriname or who has parents who were born there. Mixed marriages are defined as Antillean or Creole Surinamese respondents who are living with a white partner—that is, someone who is born in the Netherlands and has two Dutch-born parents. Because the partner in the mixed group needs to have two Dutch-born parents, we are fairly confident that all of these partners were white.³ The children of the respondents are the units of analysis, and the models we use statistically correct for the clustering of children within families. The total number of children is 554 and the number of children of mixed race is 135. The average age of the children is 17.

To construct our measures, we make use of the fact that not only the respondent but also all the children of 12 years and older who lived with the respondent were interviewed. Hence, the survey has a so-called multi-actor design. A special advantage of this design is that the number of independent variables is extensive. Using the respondent interviews, we are able to include elaborate measures of the parent, which can help us explain the effect of mixed race on children's integration.

To measure children's social integration, we focus on two questions in the survey: (1) how often the child interacted with white persons in his/her spare time (3 = often, 2 = sometimes, 1 = never), and (2) whether the child had more contact with white persons in his/her spare time or more contact with Surinamese/Antillean

persons (3 = more with white, 2 = about equal, 1 = more with Surinamese/Antilleans). The two items were standardized and then summed (the correlation between the items was .57).

The independent variables that we use can be distinguished in characteristics of parents and characteristics of children. For the children, we include age and sex, whether the child is attending school, and the current or completed level of education.

We include three types of characteristics of the minority parent: socioeconomic characteristics, cultural characteristics (characteristics that say something about the parents' cultural orientation toward the minority group), and social characteristics (characteristics that say something about the contact opportunities that parents provide). We explain these measures in detail below.

(a) Education: the highest completed educational level of the minority parent, recoded to the approximate number of years needed to complete the level of education (obtained from De Graaf and Ganzeboom 1993).

(b) Whether the parent intends to return to the Caribbean: those who indicated they would want to return are coded 1, those who did not want to return or who did not know are coded 0.

(c) Social tolerance: based on two items, whether the parent would be bothered if his or her children would have many white friends and whether the parent would be bothered if his or her children would choose a white marriage partner. The correlation between these two items is .53. We took the mean of the two (standardized) items. The higher the score, the more tolerant (i.e., the less people want to maintain a distance from whites).

(d) Social integration of the parent: based on three questions in the survey: (1) how often the parent had white friends or neighbors visit him/her, (2) how often the parent interacted with white persons in his/her spare time, and (3) whether the parent had more contact with white persons in his/her spare time or more contact with Surinamese/Antillean persons. The three items were standardized and then summed to form a scale. The reliability of the scale is good (Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$).

(e) Neighborhood integration: the percentage of non-Western immigrants in the zip code area. This information is obtained from population register data and matched to the respondents in the SPVA.⁴

We analyze the dependent variable with OLS regression. Different models were estimated. The first model contains only children's characteristics. The remaining models add socioeconomic, cultural, and social characteristics of parents in order to see to what extent the effect of mixed race is explained by the characteristics of parents. No causal order is assumed among social and cultural characteristics of parents. This means that three models are estimated: one with cultural characteristics, one with social characteristics, and one with both sets. Parental education is considered causally prior to social and cultural characteristics of parents and is therefore included in all models that contain parental characteristics. Descriptive information on differences between children of mixed and non-mixed marriages is presented in Table 1. The results of the regression models are presented in Table 2. In the models, all continuous variables, including the dependent variable, are standardized.

TABLE 1

Differences between Mixed and Non-Mixed Origin: Caribbean Children in the Netherlands

	<i>Non-Mixed Origin</i>	<i>Mixed Origin</i>	<i>Test</i>
<i>Children's Characteristics</i>			
Child is Surinamese (versus Antillean)	.61	.42	7.4*
Child's age	16.70	17.30	1.1
Child is woman (proportion)	.52	.43	3.0~
Child in school (proportion)	.20	.28	1.7
Child elementary/lower secondary education (proportion)	.43	.35	1.6
Child middle general/vocational (proportion)	.30	.30	0.1
Child tertiary education (proportion)	.07	.07	0.0
<i>Parent's Characteristics</i>			
Parents' level of education (z-score)	-.04	.20	1.9~
Minority parent's social tolerance attitudes (z-score)	-.02	.04	0.4
Minority parent's return intentions (proportion)	.48	.46	0.3
Percentage non-Western in neighborhood	.29	.18	4.2*
Parents' social integration (z-score)	-.28	.75	9.7*
<i>N</i>	328	130	458

Note: Tests corrected for clustering. Chi-2 test for dichotomous variables, *t*-test for continuous variables.

* $p < .05$, ~ $p < .10$.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the differences between children of mixed and non-mixed marriages in a descriptive fashion. We first note that 28 percent of the children are mixed, which confirms that black-white intermarriage is common in the Netherlands. The table further shows that few of the children's characteristics differ between the two groups. The one exception is the distinction between Surinamese and Antilleans. Children of mixed marriages are less often Surinamese. The reason for this is that Surinamese are less likely to intermarry than Antilleans (Kalmijn and Van Tubergen 2006). Larger differences are observed for the characteristics of parents. The minority parents of the children of mixed marriages are on average higher educated. They are not more tolerant of whites, however, and they are not less likely to return to the Caribbean. We do find that the level of social integration of the parents in mixed marriages is higher and that these parents live in less segregated neighborhoods than parents in non-mixed marriages.

Table 2 presents the effects of mixed race on children's social integration. We see in the baseline model that children of mixed marriages have more frequent contact with white persons than children of non-mixed marriages. The regression parameter can be interpreted as an effect size since the dependent variable is standardized.⁵ The effect size is $b = .55$, which shows that the difference between the groups is considerable (Cohen 1988).

Some of the control variables have significant effects. Higher educated children (with tertiary education) are more likely to have outgroup contact, which is in line with what one would expect. This will reflect both the norms and values of higher

TABLE 2
OLS Regression of Social Integration: Caribbean Children in the Netherlands

	Model A	Model B	Model C	Model D	Model E	Model F
<i>Children's Characteristics</i>						
Child is Surinamese (versus Antillean)	-.202~	-.309*	-.297*	-.225*	-.223*	-.318*
Child's age	-.020	-.017	-.012	-.018	-.015	-.018
Child is woman	-.081	-.086	-.094	-.033	-.034	-.079
Child not enrolled (versus lower educated)	.098	.120	.114	.260~	.250~	.125
Child secondary (versus lower)	.053	.021	.039	.067	.080	.021
Child tertiary (versus lower)	.397*	.349*	.323~	.320*	.314*	.357*
Mixed origin (versus non-mixed)	.554*	.480*	.454*	.039	.046	.492*
<i>Parent's Characteristics</i>						
Minority parent's level of education (z)		.214*	.214*	.107*	.108*	.246*
Mixed Origin × Parent's Education			.086~		.082~	-.103
Minority parent's social tolerance attitudes (z)			-.315*		-.182~	
Minority parent's return intentions				-.307*	-.313*	
Parent non-Western neighborhood (z)				.288*	.262*	
Parent's social integration (z)				.577*	.677*	.386*
Constant	.344	.378	.550~			
R-square	.09	.13	.16	.29	.31	.13
N children	458	458	458	458	458	458
N families	308	308	308	308	308	308

Note: Unstandardized coefficients. All variables except age and binary variables are standardized. Significance levels corrected for clustering.
**p* < .05, ~*p* < .10.

educated persons and the opportunities that higher educated minority persons have to mix with whites (Kalmijn 1998). Surinamese children are less strongly integrated than Antillean children. This difference parallels the difference in intermarriage in the parental generation (Table 1).

To what extent is the effect of mixed race due to the characteristics and behaviors of parents in a mixed marriage? In Model B, we first include parental education. The effect of parental education is significant, showing that children of higher educated parents are more integrated, even after taking into account the child's own level of education. To what extent can the effect of parental education explain the effect of mixed race? To assess this, we compare the effect of mixed race before and after including parental education. The effect declines by 13 percent, which is a modest amount (i.e., $[(.554 - .480) / .554]$).

In Model C, we include variables that pertain to the parent's cultural orientation toward the group (return intentions and social tolerance). We see that the effect of mixed race declines from .48 to .45, which shows that cultural differences do not explain the gap. The main reason for this is that such differences are small to begin with (Table 1). Both parental cultural characteristics have a significant effect on integration. Children have more frequent contact with whites when the minority parent expresses more social tolerance of whites and when the minority parent intends to stay in the Netherlands. Even though they affect integration, they do not differ between the groups and therefore cannot explain the integration gap between children of mixed and non-mixed marriages.

In Model D, we add social characteristics of parents—that is, variables that tell us something about the contact opportunities that parents provide to their children (neighborhood composition and parent's integration). These two variables have strong effects on the child's level of integration. Because both independent and dependent variables are standardized, the coefficients are standardized coefficients. The coefficient for parental integration is .29, which shows us that there is a considerable degree of intergenerational transmission of integration. The effect of the neighborhood is significant as well and shows that in neighborhoods with more non-Western immigrants, the children have less contact with white persons. The size of the effect is $-.31$, which is also considerable. To what extent do these two characteristics explain the effect of mixed race? The effect of mixed race declines from .48 to .04 and is no longer significant. In other words, the effect of mixed race is due entirely to social differences between the two groups of parents. When all parental characteristics are included simultaneously, the effect of mixed race is also not significant.

Is the effect of mixed race on integration dependent on the minority parent's socioeconomic status? To test this, we add an interaction of parental education and mixed race to Model B (in Model F). The interaction effect is not significant, in contrast to the hypothesis. Apparently, the integrative effect of mixed race is quite general. To further check these results, we also considered the role of household income. We included a main effect of household income, which appeared not to be significant. We next replaced the interaction of mixed race and education with an interaction of mixed race and household income. This interaction was not significant either. Hence, for an alternative measure of socioeconomic status, the results are essentially the same.

Is the effect of mixed race different for Surinamese and Antilleans? Although we have no prior expectations about this, we explore this issue because there is a difference between these groups in terms of their rate of intermarriage (Kalmijn and Van Tubergen 2006). When we add the interaction between mixed race and the dummy for Surinamese/Antillean to Model A, it turns out to be significant ($b = .539, p = .01$). The implied effects of mixed race are $b = .299$ for Antilleans and $b = .838$ (i.e., $.299 + .539$) for Creole Surinamese. Because the Antilleans intermarry more often than the Surinamese, one would have expected that the effect of intermarriage is stronger for Antilleans, but the interaction shows that the effect is stronger for the Creole Surinamese. This may be due to the negative reputation that Antillean teenagers have had in the Netherlands in the past decade, a reputation which is due to the widely reported high delinquency rates among young Antillean men (Van San, De Boom, and Van Wijk 2007). Although plausible, such an interpretation is still at odds with the earlier finding that Antilleans intermarry more often than Surinamese.

Finally, we examine whether there are gender differences. Is the effect of intermarriage on integration different depending on whether the black parent is the wife or the husband? Again, no clear expectations can be formulated. Authors have argued that mothers are more influential in shaping ethnic and racial identities than fathers (Rumbaut 1994), but evidence shows that ethnic minority identification is stronger when the father is the minority parent (Xie and Goyette 1997). We included an interaction of gender (minority mother = 1, minority father = 0) and mixed race and found that this was not significant (is $b = -.187, p = .30$). Interesting to note is that the sign of the interaction is negative, which is in line with Xie and Goyette's finding that the minority father is more influential.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Most of the research on the consequences of intermarriage focuses on the way parents and children identify themselves, and not on the social lives of the next generation. In this article, we focus on social integration and we analyze two minority groups in the Netherlands, the Antilleans, and the Creole Surinamese. Antilleans and Creole Surinamese are black immigrant groups in the Netherlands who migrated from the Caribbean to the Netherlands fairly recently. To estimate the effects of mixed race, we compare children with one black parent and one white parent to children with two black parents. Our results show that children of mixed marriages are more likely to have contact with white persons than children of non-mixed marriages. We realize that not everybody will be surprised about this finding, but we maintain that it is important to report this evidence. Moreover, it is not only a question of whether or not the effect exists, it is also a question of how strong the effect is, and that can only be addressed with empirical research. Our analysis shows that the effect size is .55, which, by any means, is a substantial effect.

One interpretation of these differences lies in the parents themselves. Parents in a mixed marriage may be different to begin with, before they entered marriage. Moreover, parents in a mixed marriage may engage less in ethnic socialization and may provide more diverse meeting opportunities for their children (Alba 1990).

We first demonstrate that there are considerable differences between parents. Compared to minority parents in non-mixed marriages, minority parents in mixed marriages are more highly educated, they live in less segregated neighborhoods, and they more frequently have contact with whites. We subsequently show that these differences in the parental generation are fully responsible for the effect of mixed race on the children's integration. Particularly the social characteristics of parents were important in explaining the gap. In other words, children of mixed marriages have access to more diverse (parental) networks and this is the main reason why their own contacts are more often with whites. Educational differences between the two groups of parents were also important for explaining the gap, but cultural differences were not.

When controlling for these parental characteristics, there is no remaining effect of mixed race on children's integration. How can we interpret this? Or to state it differently, what would it mean if we *had* found a remaining effect of mixed race after controlling for parental characteristics? To understand this, we rely on network theories about social contact. According to these theories, the types of persons with whom we interact are a function of supply and demand (Kalmijn and Flap 2001; Marsden 1990; Mollenhorst, Volker, and Flap 2008). First, all our possible contacts are constrained by the local settings in which we are embedded. Examples of settings are the family, the neighborhood, the school, and so forth. These settings make up the supply of contact. Second, within this more limited and typically more homogeneous pool, potential interaction partners may choose (not) to interact with each other. This is the demand part of interaction, also called the choice part. To translate this to the present case, we could say that most of the effect of mixed race works via the supply of contact and that the choices that are made within this given supply are not so much affected.

We found a negative result for another hypothesis about integration. It has been argued that children of mixed marriages would integrate more when their socioeconomic background would resemble that of whites more. Under these circumstances, whites would be more open toward the child and the child would also feel less close to his or her own group. In a sense, this is the classic hypothesis about intersecting group boundaries, which Blau has proposed many years ago (Blau and Schwartz 1984). In practice, this would suggest an interaction effect of mixed race and parental socioeconomic status. Our results show that this interaction effect is not significant. In other words, the effect of mixed race is quite general. We do find a main effect of parental education, which shows that minority children of higher status backgrounds are more integrated, but this does not strengthen or weaken the effect of being of mixed race.

Some limitations of the current study must be noted. First of all, we have used only one measure of outgroup contact for children and this measure is based on only two items. A similar scale for the parents used a third item as well and revealed a high degree of reliability, which gives us confidence in the outcome measure we used for children. Nonetheless, we would welcome new analyses that go into more detail about children's social lives. Ideally, we would use concrete data on children's friendship networks, but such data are rarely collected in the context of ethnic minority surveys. Still, we have to rely on such surveys

since the number of cases—especially the number of mixed race children—would otherwise be too small.

We have focused on black-white intermarriage in one specific context—the Netherlands—and in this sense, we have tried to broaden the scope of the study of black-white boundaries (Model et al. 1999). Although there are similarities between blacks in the Netherlands and African Americans and black Caribbeans in other countries, there are also differences. The labels “black” and “white” are less often used in the Netherlands, the issue of race is more closely linked to the issue of immigration, and the rate of black-white intermarriage in the Netherlands is higher than in the United States. In this sense, the current study provides a potential counterpoint to the situation of race relations in the United States. That the integrative effects of intermarriage are so strong in the current study may be associated with the high rate of intermarriage in the Netherlands. As a general hypothesis, we could therefore suggest that in contexts where intermarriage is less accepted, the integrative effects of mixed race will be weaker. A comparison with the United States—if it could be made—could then show more limited effects of mixed race on social integration in the American context than in the Dutch context. We look forward to such comparative studies.

Finally, our article has tested an important assumption in the literature on intermarriage. One of the motivations for studying intermarriage has been that intermarriage is not only a sign of weak group boundaries but also an engine of change. High rates of intermarriage would weaken group boundaries in society by weakening group attachments in future generations. This assumption has been made for ethnic and racial minority groups but also for religious groups and social classes. While it has become a textbook hypothesis, it has in fact not often been tested. Our research provides strong evidence for this hypothesis, which suggests that the high rates of intermarriage between blacks and whites in the Netherlands will indeed have a positive effect on group relations in the future. At the same time, however, our study makes clear that this assumption may not hold for all types of groups and in all societal contexts. To evaluate the relevance of intermarriage, it is therefore important to amplify the comparative analysis of intermarriage in past research (Model and Fisher 2002) with a comparative analysis of the consequences of intermarriage.

NOTES

1. Percentages refer to first and second generation. Percentages obtained from government statistics are published online at <http://statline.cbs.nl/statweb/>.
2. Respondents identifying as “other Surinamese” were also included since these may be Moroons who are also black. Hindustani, Javanese, and Chinese were the other options given. These categories are excluded.
3. The partners could in theory be third or higher generation Surinamese or Antilleans, but due to the recency of this migration stream, there are very few such persons in the Netherlands. The SPVA, like all population surveys in the Netherlands, does not contain questions about race or skin color. This is also the case in some other European countries such as France (Model et al. 1999).

4. No information is available on the percentage of Surinamese or Antilleans at the zip code level, but the Surinamese and the Antilleans are two of the four largest ethnic groups in the Netherlands.
5. The conventional definition of an effect size is Cohen's $d = [m(y)1 - m(y)2] / s.d.(y)$. In a bivariate regression model, the unstandardized effect of a dummy variable $b = m(y)1 - m(y)2$. Since y is standardized, $s.d.(y) = 1$, and hence $d = b$.

REFERENCES

- Alba, Richard. 1990. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Blau, Peter M. and Joseph E. Schwartz. 1984. *Crosscutting Social Circles: Testing a Macrostructural Theory of Intergroup Relations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bovenkerk, Frank. 1978. *Omdat zij anders zijn: Patronen van rasdiscriminatie in Nederland* [Because they are different: Patterns of racial discrimination in the Netherlands]. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Bratter, Jenifer L. and Karl Eschbach. 2006. "What about the Couple?" Interracial Marriage and Psychological Distress." *Social Science Research* 35(4):1025-47.
- Cauce, Ana Mari, Yumi Hiraga, Craig Mason, Tanya Aguilar, Nydia Ordóñez, and Nancy Gonzalez. 1992. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Social Adjustment of Biracial Youth." Pp. 207-22 in *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by M. P. P. Root. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Choenni, Chan and Carel Harmsen. 2007. "Geboorteplaats en Etnische Samenstelling van Surinamers in Nederland" [Place of Birth and Ethnic Composition of Surinamese in the Netherlands]. *Bevolkingstrends* 2007:74-8.
- Coenders, Marcel, Marcel Lubbers, Peer Scheepers, and Maykel Verkuyten. 2008. "More Than Two Decades of Changing Ethnic Attitudes in the Netherlands." *Journal of Social Issues* 64(2):269-85.
- Cohen, Jacob. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Second Edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dagevos, Jaco, Merove Gijsberts, and Carlo Van Praag. 2003. *Rapportage Minderheden 2003: Onderwijs, Arbeid, en Sociaal-Culturele Integratie* [Report on Minorities 2003: Schooling, Work, and Social-Cultural Integration]. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Davis, F. James. 1991. *Who Is Black? One Nation's Definition*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- De Graaf, Paul and Harry B. G. Ganzeboom. 1993. "Family Background and Educational Attainment in the Netherlands for the 1891-1960 Birth Cohorts." Pp. 75-99 in *Persistent Inequality: Changing Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries*, edited by Y. Shavit and H.-P. Blossfeld. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Essed, Philomena and Sandra Trienekens. 2007. "Who Wants to Feel White? Race, Dutch Culture and Contested Identities." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31(1):52-72.
- Finnas, Fjalar and Richard O'Leary. 2003. "Choosing for the Children: The Affiliation of the Children of Minority-Majority Group Inter marriages." *European Sociological Review* 19(5):483-99.
- Gonzalez-Ferrer, A. 2006. "Who Do Immigrants Marry? Partner Choice among Single Immigrants in Germany." *European Sociological Review* 22(2):171-85.
- Hwang, Sean-Shong, Rogelio Saenz, and Benigno E. Aguirre. 1995. "The SES Selectivity of Interracially Married Asians." *International Migration Review* 29(2):469-91.

- Jacobs, Jerry A. and Teresa G. Labov. 2002. "Gender Differences in Inter-marriage among Sixteen Race and Ethnic Groups." *Sociological Forum* 17(4):621-46.
- Jones, F. L. and Ruud Luijckx. 1996. "Post-War Patterns of Inter-marriage in Australia: The Mediterranean Experience." *European Sociological Review* 12(1):67-86.
- Kalbach, Madeline A. 2002. "Ethnic Inter-marriage in Canada." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 34(2):25-39.
- Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1993. "Trends in Black/White Inter-marriage." *Social Forces* 72(1):119-46.
- . 1998. "Inter-marriage and Homogamy: Causes, Patterns, Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24(1):395-421.
- and Henk Flap. 2001. "Assortative Meeting and Mating: Unintended Consequences of Organized Settings for Partner Choices." *Social Forces* 79(4):1289-312.
- and Frank Van Tubergen. 2006. "Ethnic Inter-marriage in the Netherlands: Confirmations and Refutations of Accepted Insights." *European Journal of Population* 22(4):371-97.
- Klein, Thomas. 2001. "Inter-marriages between Germans and Foreigners in Germany." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 32(3):325-46.
- Koopmans, Ruud. 2006. "De Politieke Mobilisatie van Allochtonen: Een Vergelijking van Nederland, Duitsland, Frankrijk, Groot-Brittannië en Zwitserland" [The Political Mobilization of Immigrants: A Comparison of the Netherlands, Germany, France, Great-Britain, and Switzerland]. *Mens & Maatschappij* 81:111-35.
- Lee, Jennifer and Frank D. Bean. 2004. "America's Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identification." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30(1):221-42.
- Liebersohn, Stanley. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants since 1880*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Liebler, Carolyn A. 2004. "Ties on the Fringes of Identity." *Social Science Research* 33(4):702-23.
- Marsden, Peter V. 1990. "Network Diversity, Substructures, and Opportunities for Contact." Pp. 397-410 in *Structures of Power and Constraint*, edited by C. Calhoun, M. W. Meyer, and W. Richard. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Model, Suzanne and Gene Fisher. 2002. "Unions between Blacks and Whites: England and the US Compared." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(5):728-54.
- , Gene Fisher, and Roxane Silberman. 1999. "Black Caribbeans in Comparative Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 25(2):187-212.
- Mollenhorst, Gerald, Beate Volker, and Henk Flap. 2008. "Social Contexts and Core Discussion Networks: Using a Choice-Constraint Approach to Study Similarity in Intimate Relationships." *Social Forces* 86(3):937-65.
- Monden, Christiaan W. S. and Jeroen Smits. 2005. "Ethnic Inter-marriage in Times of Social Change: The Case of Latvia." *Demography* 42(2):323-45.
- Okun, Barbara S. 2001. "The Effects of Ethnicity and Educational Attainment on Jewish Marriage Patterns: Changes in Israel, 1957-1995." *Population Studies* 55(1):49-64.
- . 2004. "Insight into Ethnic Flux: Marriage Patterns among Jews of Mixed Ancestry in Israel." *Demography* 41(1):173-87.
- Qian, Zhenchao. 2004. "Options: Racial/Ethnic Identification of Children of Inter-married Couples." *Social Science Quarterly* 85(3):746-66.
- , Sampson Lee Blair, and Stacey D. Ruf. 2001. "Asian American Interracial and Interethnic Marriages: Differences by Education and Nativity." *International Migration Review* 35(2):557-86.
- and Daniel T. Lichter. 2007. "Social Boundaries and Marital Assimilation: Interpreting Trends in Racial and Ethnic Inter-marriage." *American Sociological Review* 72(1):68-94.
- Root, Maria P. P. 1992. *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Roy, Parimal and Ian Hamilton. 2000. "Inter-marriage among Italians: Some Regional Variations in Australia." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 31(1):63-78.

- Rumbaut, Ruben G. 1994. "The Crucible within: Ethnic Identity, Self-Esteem, and Segmented Assimilation among Children of Immigrants." *International Migration Review* 28(4):748–94.
- Saenz, Rogelio, Sean-Shong Hwang, and Robert Anderson. 1995. "Persistence and Change in Asian Identity among Children of Intermarried Couples." *Sociological Perspectives* 38(2):175–94.
- Scheepers, Peer, Merove Gijsberts, and Marcel Coenders. 2002. "Ethnic Exclusionism in European Countries: Public Opposition to Civil Rights for Legal Migrants as a Response to Perceived Ethnic Threat." *European Sociological Review* 18(6):17–34.
- Schermerhorn, Richard Alonzo. 1970. *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stephan, Cookie White and Walter G. Stephan. 1989. "After Intermarriage: Ethnic Identify among Mixed-heritage Japanese-Americans and Hispanics." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51(2):507–19.
- Stephan, Walter G. and Cookie White Stephan. 1991. "Intermarriage: Effects on Personality, Adjustment, and Intergroup Relations in Two Samples of Students." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53(1):241–50.
- St-Hilaire, Aonghas. 2001. "Ethnicity, Assimilation and Nation in Plural Suriname." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24(6):998–1019.
- Uunk, Wilfred. 2003. "The Cultural Integration of Immigrants in the Netherlands: A Description and Explanation of Modern Attitudes of Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, Antilleans, and the Indigenous Population." Pp. 199–234 in *Integrating Immigrants in the Netherlands: Cultural versus Socio-economic Integration*, edited by L. Hagendoorn, J. Veenman, and W. Vollebergh. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Van Niekerk, Mies. 2000. "Creoles and Hindustanis: Patterns of Social Mobility in Two Surinamese Immigrant Groups in the Netherlands." Pp. 184–205 in *Immigrants, Schooling and Social Mobility: Does Culture Make a Difference*, edited by H. Vermeulen and J. Perlmann. Houndmills, UK: MacMillan.
- Van San, Marion, Jan De Boom, and Anton Van Wijk. 2007. *Verslaafd aan een Flitsende Levensstijl: Criminaliteit van Antilliaanse Rotterdamers* [Addicted to a Flashy Lifestyle: Crime among Antilleans in Rotterdam]. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: RISBO/EUR.
- Van Tubergen, Frank and Matthijs Kalmijn. 2009. "Language Proficiency and Usage among Immigrants in the Netherlands: Incentives or Opportunities." *European Sociological Review* 25(2):169–82.
- and Ineke Maas. 2007. "Ethnic Intermarriage among Immigrants in the Netherlands: An Analysis of Population Data." *Social Science Research* 36(3):1065–86.
- Verkuyten, Maykel and Barbara Kinket. 2000. "Social Distances in a Multi-Ethnic Society: The Ethnic Hierarchy among Dutch Preadolescents." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63(1):75–85.
- and Jochem Thijs. 2002. "Racist Victimization among Children in the Netherlands: The Effect of Ethnic Group and School." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(2):310–31.
- Xie, Yu and Kimberly Goyette. 1997. "The Racial Identification of Biracial Children with One Asian Parent: Evidence from the 1990 Census." *Social Forces* 76(2):547–70.