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Introduction

- Marriage patterns are of sociological and general interest
- Focus on ethnic homogamy/endogamy vs exogamy

- 2011 custom Census data matching couples
- Percentages and log-linear models

- Examining patterns by indigenous status, birthplace, and ancestry
Indigenous Status

• Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islanders

• More homogamy:
  – Rural
  – WA and NT

• Less homogamy
  – Capital cities
  – Certificate/diploma/degree highest qualification

• Decreasing homogamy in all areas over time
Birthplace

• Highest homogamy (based on log-linear)
  – Bangladesh, Nepal, Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan

• Lowest homogamy (based on log-linear)
  – England, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Scotland

• Largest asymmetry
  – Thailand, Philippines, Japan

* Census data does not indicate location of partnership formation
Ancestry

• Used those with single ancestry to get mutually exclusive groups

• Highest homogamy (based on log-linear)
  – Australian Aboriginal, Indian, Bangladeshi, Sri Lankan, Burmese

• Lowest homogamy (based on log-linear)
  – Scottish, Irish, Syrian, German, English, Dutch, Australian

• Largest asymmetry
  – Thai, Japanese, Filipino, Indonesian
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