

The Educational Homogamy Gap Between Married and Cohabiting Couples in Latin America

Albert Esteve · Robert McCaa · Luis Ángel López

Received: 11 October 2011 / Accepted: 31 October 2012 / Published online: 6 December 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2012

Abstract The explosive expansion of non-marital cohabitation in Latin America since the 1970s has led to the narrowing of the gap in educational homogamy between married and cohabiting couples (what we call “homogamy gap”) as shown by our analysis of 29 census samples encompassing eight countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, and Panama ($N = 2,295,160$ young couples). Most research on the homogamy gap is limited to a single decade and a small group of developed countries (the United States, Canada, and Europe). We take a historical and cross-national perspective and expand the research to a range of developing countries, where since early colonial times, traditional forms of cohabitation among the poor, uneducated sectors of society have coexisted with marriage, although to widely varying degrees from country to country. In recent decades, cohabitation is emerging in all sectors of society. We find that among married couples, educational homogamy continues to be higher than for those who cohabit, but in recent decades, the difference has narrowed substantially in all countries. We argue that assortative mating between cohabiting and married couples tends to be similar when the contexts in which they are formed are also increasingly similar.

Keywords Marriage · Cohabitation · Educational homogamy · Latin America

A. Esteve (✉)
Centre d'Estudis Demogràfics, Campus UAB, Edifici E2, Bellaterra, 08193 Barcelona, Spain
e-mail: aesteve@ced.uab.es

R. McCaa
Minnesota Population Center, Minneapolis, MN, USA

L. Á. López
Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad de Costa Rica, Mercedes, Costa Rica

Introduction

Non-marital cohabitation has spread dramatically in Latin America during the last four decades. In the 1970s, cohabiting couples were more likely to form among lower social strata, among indigenous and African-descent populations, and in remote rural areas. By the 2000s, cohabitation had spread among higher social and educational groups and in urban areas (Castro 2002; De Vos 1998; Esteve et al. 2012). Consequently, marriage rates have been declining throughout the region. Despite this decline and other social transformations (e.g., educational expansion, women's rising labor force participation, fertility decline), the age at union formation has remained remarkably stable (Fussell and Palloni 2004; Mensch et al. 2005; United Nations 1990). This stability implies a process in which young cohorts are increasingly likely to substitute marriage for non-marital cohabitation without substantially modifying the timing of union formation. There are diverse explanations for the shift away from marriage into cohabitation. Some authors emphasize the strength of familism in times of economic hardship (Fussell and Palloni 2004), while other scholars question whether cultural transformations and value changes according to the postulates of a second demographic transition (Lesthaeghe 1991) explain this dramatic shift (Quilodran 1999). One potential consequence of these trends is the blurring of differences between marital and non-marital unions.

In this paper, we examine the differences between marital and non-marital cohabitation (hereafter called “marriage” and “cohabitation,” respectively) through the lens of educational homogamy using census microdata from eight Latin American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, and Panama) from 1970 to 2000. Homogamy refers to the tendency of individuals to marry or cohabit with someone of the same educational group. First, we examine whether levels of educational homogamy differ between married and cohabiting couples. We refer to the difference between the two types of unions as the *homogamy gap*. Second, we examine variation in the size of the homogamy gap across countries and over time to determine whether the gap is correlated with the spread of cohabitation (measured as the proportion of cohabiting couples over the total number of unions). The motivation of the paper is twofold. First, we seek to shed light on how patterns of assortative mating differ between marriage and cohabiting unions. Second, we wish to determine if patterns of assortative mating among cohabiting and married couples became more similar as the social contexts of cohabitation and marriage converge.

The paper presents original findings with regard to research on assortative mating differences between marriage and cohabitation. First, we present evidence from a large and diverse set of Latin American countries concerning the historical presence and recent spread of non-marital cohabitation. To date, most contributions on this topic are limited to the United States (Blackwell and Lichter 2000, 2004; Schoen and Weinick 1993), Canada, and a few European countries (Hamplova 2009; Hamplova and Le Bourdais 2008). Second, we explore the issue of marriage and cohabitation from a historical perspective. Existing research has examined this issue for specific cohorts entering into unions within a single historical context (e.g., Blackwell and Lichter 2000, 2004; Schoen and Weinick 1993) and has compared

regions and countries at a single point in time (e.g., Hamplova 2009). Although the use of cross-sectional data from censuses has the obvious limitation of not capturing precise causality for the transition into and out of cohabitation and marriage (Schwartz 2010), the availability of cohabitation data in Latin American censuses from 1970 to 2000 allows us to examine the relationship between the homogamy gap and the spread of cohabitation over three decades in Latin America.

Background

Non-marital Cohabitation in Latin America

One of the most salient aspects of Latin American nuptiality lies in the historical importance of cohabitation. Non-marital cohabitation has coexisted with traditional marriage in Latin America at least since early colonial times. A blend of cultural, historical, economic, and political factors explains this phenomenon (Rodríguez 2005). Colonial religious authorities were stymied in their efforts to impose marriage as the only type of union between men and women primarily because of weak institutions and the conflicts and cultural barriers that existed between the colonizers and natives (Quilodran 1999). Miscegenation, which was encouraged by the high male-to-female sex ratio among European settlers, and gender and ethnic power favored non-marital cohabitation (Bernard and Gruzinski 1996; De Vos 1998; McCaa 1994). Extreme economic inequalities, poverty, the costs of formalizing unions (e.g., marriage fees and celebrations), and the legal advantage obtained by protecting wealth from “spurious” claims (Castro 2002) further promoted informal unions. With the establishment of independent states, political instability arose partly as a result of church-state struggles, including struggles with regard to the issue of civil versus religious unions, and this instability favored the spread of cohabitation (Rodríguez 2005). Both liberal and conservative states stripped women of their power to force suitors who had enjoyed prenuptial liberties to marry by increasing the age of majority for men to twenty-six years and declaring that only notarized promises of marriage were legally binding (McCaa 1994).

Despite these similarities, Latin America is not a homogeneous region. Quilodran (2003) distinguishes three main groups based on cross-country differences (low, middle, and high levels of cohabitation). The group with the lowest levels, in which cohabitation accounts for less than one-fifth of all unions, includes Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Costa Rica, and Mexico. The middle group, in which one- to two-fifths of all unions are cohabiting couples, includes the remaining South American countries—Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Peru. Finally, the group with the highest rates of cohabitation includes the Caribbean and Central American regions (e.g., Panama, Nicaragua, Cuba, Dominican Republic, and Haiti), where cohabitation accounts for two-fifths or more of all unions. The low prevalence of cohabitation in the Cone of South America is due to the relatively small indigenous and Afro-American populations, the influence of European immigration at the beginning of the twentieth century, relatively higher income and higher levels of social development compared with other Latin American countries,

and the existence of stronger and more organized states (Rodríguez 2005). In contrast, higher levels of cohabitation in the Caribbean and Central America are associated with poor living conditions; a large indigenous, mestizo, or Afro-American population (whose origin is marked by the importation of African slaves to work on Spanish, French, Dutch, and English plantations (Charbit 1987); and the existence of weak and less organized states (Rodríguez 2005, p. 20).

During recent decades, cross-national differences in the degree of cohabitation have narrowed due to the spread of this type of union. There has been an increase in cohabitation in countries where levels were formerly the lowest, and the levels have remained constant or increased slightly in countries the levels of which were previously the highest (Castro 2002; De Vos 1998; Quilodran 1999; Rodríguez 2005). In all countries in this region, the poorest people are more likely to cohabit, but in recent decades, cohabitation has spread in all social classes, especially among the more highly educated (Castro and Martín 2008; López 2009; Rodríguez 2005). The rise of cohabitation took place both in areas with “old cohabitation” practices and in areas where cohabitation remained more exceptional until the 1970s (Esteve et al. 2012, p. 55). The “boom” of cohabitation occurred despite the sharp increase in educational attainment, particularly for females. Given the inverse relationship between education and cohabitation, advances in education over time should have led to an increase in marriage. Instead, cohabitation expanded in all Latin American countries, suggesting the influence of other factors favorable to cohabitation. In particular, recent research suggests that the rise of cohabitation developed in a context of growing individual autonomy and greater overall tolerance (Esteve et al. 2012, p. 76).

The above explanations describe a particular historical, economic, political, and cultural context, meaning that non-marital cohabitation in Latin America cannot be compared to that in developed countries where cohabitation is understood as a sign of women’s independence and of ideological rebuke against institutional intrusion in private life (Castro and Martín 2008; Manting 1996; Van de Kaa 1988). Furthermore, in Latin America, cohabitation remains common at later stages of the life cycle and cohabiting couples regularly bear and rear children together (Castro & Martín 2008; Quilodran 1992; Rosero-Bixby 1996) even though some of these unions are eventually legalized at older ages. On the other hand, some signals of partial convergence of Latin American countries to the European pattern of second demographic transition seem to occur in the region. While a many-sided discussion of this convergence is emerging in the Latin American literature (e.g., García 2002; Castro 2002; Cabella 2004; Rodríguez 2005), there is, though, a wide consensus that the contexts in which cohabitation and marriage emerge are increasingly similar. In this regard, we aim to observe if patterns of assortative mating among cohabiting and married couples tend to be similar once their social contexts are similar. By social context, we refer to the physical and social setting in which cohabitation or marriage happens or develops. Historically, these contexts were socially and spatially segregated, meaning that cohabitation was mostly found among lower social strata and in specific regions. Nevertheless, beginning in the 1970s, countries and regions with low or moderate levels of cohabitation witnessed rises in cohabitation. In addition, cohabitation has been rising over time among men and women in all educational groups, and sometimes more among the highly educated

(Esteve et al. 2012). Further, recent research shows that the considerable drop in proportions of married people prior to age 30 is mainly due to the substitution of marriage by cohabitation (Esteve et. al. forthcoming).

Why We Expect a Homogamy Gap. Existing Hypotheses

Education is an important structuring dimension of modern marriage markets. Individuals tend to marry or partner within their own educational groups, and this pattern is more clearly observed at both ends of the educational hierarchy. First, education is considered the most important determinant of varying degrees of success in the occupational structures of industrialized societies; second, education reflects the influence of cultural resources in partner selection (Blossfeld and Timm 2003). Societies that have experienced strong educational expansion processes are more likely to present higher levels of homogamy. A significant amount of empirical evidence from various social contexts sustains this hypothesis (Blossfeld and Timm 2003; Mare 1991; Schwartz and Mare 2005; Smits et al. 1998). Research from Latin America also substantiates this pattern (Esteve and López-Ruiz 2010; Esteve and McCaa 2007; Torche 2010).

Few studies have examined the difference in educational homogamy between marital and non-marital cohabitation (Blackwell and Lichter 2000, 2004; Hamplova 2009; Hamplova and Le Bourdais 2008; Schoen and Weinick 1993; Schwartz 2010). Recent research has identified three main hypotheses: *looser bonds*, *winning*, and *institutionalization*.

The *looser bonds* hypothesis (Schoen and Weinick 1993) argues that educational homogamy will differ by type of union and that cohabitation shows greater homogamy than marriage with respect to achieved characteristics, such as education, and less homogamy for ascribed traits (e.g., ethnicity and religion) (Schwartz 2010, p. 409). The *looser bonds* hypothesis offers the view that cohabitation is a distinct institutional form of union with its own norms, goals, and behaviors. Cohabitation differs from marriage because it is associated with a weaker sense of commitment and greater personal autonomy. Potential cohabitants are faced with certain challenges that stimulate interactions that are largely based on gender equality (Brines and Joyner 1999). A high degree of uncertainty, the lack of long-term horizons, and the absence of legal contracts that may discourage the dissolution of unions (England and Farkas 1986) make cohabitants more likely to emphasize achieved statuses (such educational attainment) rather than ascribed traits.

Conversely, the double selection or *winning hypothesis* asserts that cohabitation is a part of the courtship process (Blackwell and Lichter 2000, 2004), a transitional stage between singlehood and marriage. A winnowing process occurs throughout this transition period, in which couples with higher affinity are more likely to marry (Rindfuss and Vanden Heuvel 1990). Under this premise, a suitable match is less relevant in short-term relationships, such as cohabitation, than in long-term relationships, such as marriage. As a result, the winnowing hypothesis argues that unmarried partners will be less homogamous than married couples with respect to both achieved and ascribed characteristics (Blackwell and Lichter 2000, p. 279).

Schwartz (2010) provides additional insight on the specific mechanisms by which cohabiting unions are less likely to be educationally homogamous than married couples. Using data from the United States' National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, Schwartz identifies the effect of transitions into and out of cohabitation and marriage and concludes that "the small and statistically insignificant tendency for homogamous cohabiters to exit their unions combined with the more pronounced tendency for dissimilar married couples to split up largely account for differences in the odds of homogamy by type of union" (Schwartz 2010, p. 749). Although this conclusion was consistent with the winnowing hypothesis, Schwartz's results did not support the assumption that the partner selection practices of cohabiters and married people differed. Rather, no statistical differences in partner choices were found at the time that cohabiting and marital unions were formed.

In all of the main studies cited here (Blackwell and Lichter 2000, 2004; Schoen and Weinick 1993; Schwartz 2010), hypotheses were drawn from and tested on specific cohorts entering the marriage market in the same historical period. Kiernan (2002) suggests that the differences between marriage and cohabitation may change as the degree of institutionalization of cohabitation shifts in society. Following Cherlin (2004), Soons and Kalmijn define institutionalization "as the development and strengthening of social norms that define people's behavior in a social institution" (Soons and Kalmijn, 2009, p. 1149). Measures of institutionalization range from raw percentages of cohabiting unions to more nuanced indicators based on the social acceptance of this type of union.

When applied to assortative mating, the *institutionalization hypothesis* predicts that in countries where non-marital cohabitation is low or where there are high levels of disapproval for such unions, cohabiting unions will tend to be more homogamous than marriages (Hamplova 2009; Hamplova and Le Bourdais 2008). In societies with intermediate levels of institutionalization, many couples regard non-marital cohabitation as a trial period before marriage. In such a context, cohabiting unions are more likely to be less homogamous than married couples with regard to education. Finally, in those contexts in which informal cohabitation is widely accepted, educational homogamy patterns for both types of unions will tend to converge.

Hamplova and Le Bourdais (2008) found no support for this hypothesis when comparing differences between the Quebec province (where cohabitation is widespread) and the other Canadian provinces (where it is less widespread). A later study conducted by Hamplova (2009) found partial support for the institutionalization hypothesis when examining differences across European countries (Hamplova 2009). The homogamy gap was lower in those countries in which cohabitation was more widespread, but the gap was not observed in the expected direction: Cohabiting couples were more likely to be homogamous than married couples at all levels of institutionalization.

Hypotheses for Latin America

If a homogamy gap exists in Latin America, will the strength of educational homogamy be higher among cohabiting couples than among married couples? We hypothesize that *cohabiting unions will be less homogamous than marriages*.

Blackwell and Lichter's *winnowing hypothesis* (2000, 2004) suggests that an increased selectivity in the choices of partners based on their levels of commitment (from dating, cohabiting, and married couples) leads to higher homogamy levels among married couples. However, we argue that cohabiting couples will be less likely to be homogamous in the Latin American context because the structuring role of education is less significant in cohabiting partner markets than in marriage markets. In this hypothesis, the argument developed by Schwartz to explain the lack of significant differences in homogamy between married and cohabiting couples in the U.S. is extended to the Latin American context: Both marriages and cohabiting unions showed similar levels of educational homogamy because of their access to similar opportunities to meet potential mates in partner markets that were structured by education (Schwartz 2010, p. 750).

In Latin America, the context of opportunities in the cohabiting partner market is less structured by education than in the marriage market. Given that cohabiting couples were historically more likely to be found in the lower social classes, among less educated people and in indigenous populations, education has theoretically had less influence on partner choices. Conversely, marriages are distributed across the educational spectrum and, as result, are more selective with regard to education. As cohabitation spreads into higher social strata and escapes its traditional boundaries, opportunities in partner markets will become similar. In other words, given the low expansion of education in the contexts where the institutionalization of marriage was not present, it is to be expected that education played a less important role in partner selection among cohabiting couples. Alternatively, other dimensions were important such as ethnicity, race, or class origins.

How will the homogamy gap vary with regard to various levels of cohabitation? A straightforward application of the institutionalization hypothesis in Latin American countries should find a smaller homogamy gap in areas in which cohabitation is more widespread. A standard way to measure the institutionalization of cohabitation involves the calculation of the proportion of cohabiting unions among all unions (Hamplova 2009; Soons and Kalmijn 2009). When this proportion is larger, the homogamy gap should be smaller. This relationship should be observed both over time and across countries. Nevertheless, a nuanced view of this hypothesis should also consider the differences between countries regarding the importance and historical roots of unmarried cohabitation in the region (as described in Sect. [Background](#)). In contrast with European countries (Soons and Kalmijn 2009), Latin American countries cannot be ordered on a continuum from traditional to modern societies based on levels of cohabitation. Rather, unmarried cohabitation has long been socially accepted, but confined to certain subgroups of the population and to particular regions within Latin America (Castro 2002; De Vos 1998). Thus, *we hypothesize that the cross-country correlation between the homogamy gap and the spread of cohabitation will be weaker than the over-time correlation*. This hypothesis is based on our observation in Sect. [Background](#) that the initial level of cohabiting unions (as measured by 1970 census round microdata) does not correspond to different stages of development.

As a follow-up hypothesis, we predict that *the association between the homogamy gap in assortative mating and the spread of cohabitation will be stronger in those countries where cohabitation was less widespread in the 1970s*.

This association will be stronger because cohabitation in these countries should be less mixed between traditional and modern forms than in countries with stronger traditions of cohabitation. In countries such as Argentina or Chile, we should expect a close correlation between the homogamy gap and the spread of cohabitation that is in line with the institutionalization hypothesis. All in all, we expect that the patterns of assortative mating will be increasingly similar as the contexts in which cohabitation and marriage occur also become increasingly similar.

Data and Method

Census Samples

We use Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) samples from the following Latin American countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, and Panama (Minnesota Population Center 2011). Table 1 provides some additional information pertaining to the sample characteristics and years included in the analysis. The samples from the 1960s census rounds cannot be used because person records are not organized by household; therefore, the educational attainment of the spouses cannot be determined. We study prevailing married and cohabiting couples. Prevailing unions are subject to bias because of selective union dissolution, educational upgrading after union formation, and the establishment of new unions (Schwartz and Mare 2005, 2012). New unions are free from this bias. Nevertheless, neither data pertaining to new unions nor longitudinal data on couples are available for the Latin American countries and years included in our analysis. These constraints compel us to make careful statements about our results.

Schwartz and Mare have identified four proximate determinants of educational homogamy: the effects of first marriage, marital dissolution, remarriage, and educational upgrading (Schwartz and Mare 2012). The authors quantify the contribution of each of these effects on educational homogamy using data for a cohort of women born in the US between 1957 and 1964. Their results have important implications for researchers who work with data on prevailing couples. The main conclusion is that the odds of homogamy in prevailing couples are overwhelmingly attributable to new first marriages (Schwartz and Mare 2012, p. 646) and that the impact of educational upgrades after marriage, remarriage, and divorce is relatively small. Nevertheless, when the aim is to compare differences in assortative mating between married and cohabiting couples, selective dissolution, remarriage, and educational upgrades may account for most of the differences (Schwartz 2010).

To reduce the effect of this bias, we selected couples in which both spouses were between 25 and 34 years old. The total number of couples for each sample and the share of individuals in unions at these ages are displayed in Table 1. The use of age limits for the purpose of filtering couples is a common practice for this type of research (Esteve and López-Ruiz 2010; Torche 2010). The 10-year age range avoids overlapping cohorts between censuses and insures that a large portion of the cohort who will eventually enter into a union is observed (Torche 2010). In addition, most

Table 1 Sample characteristics and numbers of couples (both spouses aged 25–34)

Country	Years	Sample density (%)	Number of couples	Cohabiting couples (%)	Men 25–34 in unions (%)	Women 25–34 in unions (%)
Argentina						
	1970	2.0	12,122	9.0	66.4	75.6
	1980	10.0	77,152	12.4	70.0	77.1
	1991	10.0	1,28,937	17.7	69.5	75.4
	2001	10.0	98,991	32.9	60.9	67.0
Brazil						
	1970	5.0	1,28,374	5.6	70.7	75.7
	1980	5.0	1,83,928	9.8	74.4	76.3
	1991	5.8	2,78,378	17.6	68.8	72.6
	2000	6.0	2,99,680	33.2	65.8	70.1
Chile						
	1970	10.0	20,897	3.2	68.6	71.0
	1982	10.0	34,314	4.8	69.8	70.8
	1992	10.0	47,368	8.2	66.1	70.6
	2002	10.0	41,035	19.7	56.3	64.4
Colombia						
	1973	10.0	33,929	16.2	65.5	71.2
	1985	10.0	68,091	28.1	65.5	69.2
	2005	10.0	85,322	63.0	62.2	68.5
Costa Rica						
	1973	10.0	4,196	13.3	71.1	74.0
	1984	10.0	7,851	15.8	71.9	72.5
	2000	10.0	11,401	27.2	65.1	71.7
Ecuador						
	1974	10.0	13,372	20.8	70.7	77.4
	1982	10.0	19,300	24.8	74.7	77.9
	1990	10.0	27,213	25.8	71.8	75.8
	2001	10.0	32,220	32.6	69.2	72.5
Mexico						
	1970	1.0	12,234	12.8	77.1	80.4
	1990	10.0	2,69,725	11.6	76.5	78.4
	2000	10.5	3,37,972	17.9	74.8	76.0
Panama						
	1970	10.0	3,001	52.8	66.1	75.7
	1980	10.0	4,721	46.9	67.0	73.2
	1990	10.0	5,957	46.6	62.1	70.0
	2000	10.0	7,479	56.1	60.8	69.2

Source the calculations are based on Latin American census microdata samples from IPUMS-International

of the population has completed their education by the age of 25. Evidence on the effect of union dissolution selectivity in Latin America is lacking. Thus, age restrictions have been applied based on findings from other contexts (e.g., Mare 1991).

The extent to which selecting young couples is enough to overcome the bias of using prevailing couples is difficult to determine. In Latin America, there are neither longitudinal datasets on couples nor marriage and cohabitation registration statistics with information on partners' educational attainment to examine which determinants contribute the most to the differences in assortative mating between married and cohabiting couples. The little research done in Latin America about union stability indicates that instability has increased in the region, both among cohabiting and married couples (Cabella 2010; García 2002). Cohabiting couples are, though, less stable than married couples. In Mexico, younger generations in cohabitation are more likely to legalize their unions than older ones, particularly those with higher education (Pérez-Amador 2008). Consistent with this fact, women who enter into cohabitation at younger ages are more likely to separate from their companions than women who started cohabitation at an older age. Higher educated people tend to enter into cohabitation at later ages. All together, these results suggest that, more and more, the stock of marriages is benefiting from an inflow of selected cohabiting couples. If this is the case, the homogamy gap between married and cohabiting couples due to flows from cohabitation to marriage should increase over time.

This analysis includes data from different points in time. It may be argued that changes in the common age of marriage (or union formation) may affect the degree of selectivity (Mare 1991; Shafer and Zhenchao 2010). Nevertheless, the timing of union formation in the eight Latin American countries studied here has been remarkably stable during the last three decades (Heaton et al. 2002; Mensch 2005; United Nations 1990).

The data are arranged in a contingency table, which cross-classifies prevailing couples as a function of their countries of residence, census rounds, types of unions, and the educational attainment of spouses. The country and census round variables require no explanation except that the time references within each census round are not identical (see Table 1).

Type of Union

As mentioned above, cohabitation has been historically widespread in Latin America when compared with other regions of the world. Latin American censuses have historically captured this phenomenon. The standard approach for identifying a cohabiting person is through the use of the “marital status” question on the census form. “Cohabiting partner” is included among the categories available for this variable. Because this item is an individual question, cohabiting people are easily identified.

Table 1 shows the proportions of cohabitating couples by country and sample. The data confirm the patterns and tendencies observed by previous studies (Castro 2002; De Vos 1998; Rosero-Bixby 1996). Cohabiting unions are fairly well rooted in Latin America, but the levels differ from country to country. In the 1970s, Panama and Chile had the highest and lowest proportions of cohabiting unions (53.8

and 3.2 %, respectively). With the sole exception of Panama, cohabitation has increased substantially during the period from 1970 to 2000 in all countries. The largest increases are found in Brazil and Chile, in which cohabitation increases fivefold to 33.2 and 19.7 %, respectively.

Educational Attainment

The level of education used as a reference is the response given in the census and may not correspond to the education level of the spouses at the time that they married or entered unions. This decision was based on data availability and should not have an important effect on the final results because most unions begin after education is completed. We distinguish four categories of educational attainment: “some primary school,” “primary school completed,” “secondary school completed,” and “university studies completed.” This classification corresponds to the major divisions of educational attainment (EDATTAN) as harmonized by the IPUMS-International (Esteve and Sobek 2003). EDATTAN uses the principles and recommendations of the United Nations regarding the measurement of educational attainment in population censuses as a reference (UNESCO 2006). The UNESCO scheme is based on 4 thresholds: 6 years of primary school, 3 years of lower secondary education, 3 years of higher secondary education, and later tertiary education. With some exceptions (see a detailed discussion at www.ipums.org/international), most Latin American countries conform to this scheme (McMeekin 1998; Torche 2010). The four categories offer sufficient variance to support comparative analysis.

Log-Linear Models and the Measurement of the Homogamy Gap

We use log-linear models to analyze a five-way table of enumerated couples that cross-classifies the following categories: male education (4 categories), female education (4 categories), type of union (2 categories), census round (4 categories), and country (8 categories). We pool the data from all countries to compare the importance of the cross-country variation in the homogamy gap to the over-time variation, as predicted by one of our hypotheses. To compute the log-linear models for the eight countries, we make a number of assumptions regarding countries in which data from only three census rounds are available: Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico. In such cases, we impute a three-way contingency table that cross-classifies the education of males, the education of females, and the types of unions¹. The specification of this distribution has no effect on the final results because our model specification allows for unrestricted associations between the education of partners by country and by census round.

A simplified version of our baseline model for a single country and period of time can be written as follows:

¹ Each of the imputed tables consists of the global 4 by 4 by 2 (male’s education, female’s education, type of union) contingency table scaled down by 10,000 to reduce the number of cases. Since all parameters were interacted, the values in these imputed tables had no effect on the other estimates. The results for these 3 unavailable samples were dropped.

$$\ln(F_{ijk}) = \mu + \mu_i^M + \mu_j^F + \mu_k^U + \mu_{ik}^{MU} + \mu_{jk}^{FU} + \mu_{ij}^{MF} \quad (1)$$

where $\ln(F_{ijk})$ is the log of the expected cell frequency of the cases for cell ijk in the contingency table; i , j , and k refer to the categories within the variables M (male education), F (female education), and U (type of union); μ is the overall mean of the natural log of the expected frequencies; μ_i^M is the effect that male education i has on the cell frequencies (the same for μ_j^F and μ_k^U); μ_{ik}^{MU} and μ_{jk}^{FU} refer to the interaction effect between male education and the type of union (MU) and female education and the type of union (FU); and μ_{ij}^{MF} is the interaction effect between male and female education.

If couples were not classified by type of union, then this model would correspond to a saturated model because it would include all possible one-way and two-way interaction effects in a two-way contingency table. The model assumes unrestricted associations between male and female education, but assumes that the pattern for married and cohabiting couples is identical. To test whether this assumption holds true, we examine the following model:

$$\ln(F_{ijk}) = \mu + \mu_i^M + \mu_j^F + \mu_k^U + \mu_{ik}^{MU} + \mu_{jk}^{FU} + \mu_{ij}^{MF} + \gamma_k^U \quad (2)$$

where $\gamma_k = 1$ when male education is equal to female education and 0 otherwise. With regard to (1), this model yields two additional effects that enable variation in educational homogamy according to type of union. This variation is expressed in a single parameter that applies to all homogamous couples. We refer to this parameter as the *homogamy* parameter. The differences between the homogamy parameters for married and cohabiting couples correspond to the *homogamy gap* between married and cohabiting couples: $\Delta\gamma_k^U = \gamma_1^U - \gamma_2^U$ ($k = 1$ for married couples and $k = 2$ for cohabiting couples).

Results

Trends in Cohabitation by Educational Attainment

Table 2 shows the proportions of cohabiting couples by their levels of educational attainment, sex, country, and census round. Despite differences across countries and over time, a number of general observations can be offered. First, cohabitation is not evenly spread across educational groups. The prevalence of cohabitation decreases as the levels of educational attainment increase. This pattern is repeated in all countries and shows no significant differences between men and women. The differences between educational groups are more pronounced in early periods, including the 1970 and 1980 census rounds. In the 1970s, cohabitation was almost nonexistent among university graduates. In Panama, where more than 50 % couples were cohabiting, only 3.4 % of college-educated men in a union were cohabiting. In contrast, 75 % of men who had not completed primary education were cohabiting. In Chile, in which cohabiting relationships represented only 3.2 % of couples, cohabitation was virtually nonexistent among college-educated men and women and

Table 2 Share of cohabitation by educational group, sex, country, and census round (couples aged 25–39 years)

	1970s						1980s						1990s						2000s					
	<Prim.		Sec.		Uni.		Tot.		<Prim.		Sec.		Uni.		Tot.		<Prim.		Sec.		Uni.		Tot.	
	Prim.	Sec.	Uni.	Tot.	Prim.	Sec.	Uni.	Tot.	Prim.	Sec.	Uni.	Tot.	Prim.	Sec.	Uni.	Tot.	Prim.	Sec.	Uni.	Tot.	Prim.	Sec.	Uni.	Tot.
Men																								
Argentina	19.7	5.4	1.2	0.7	9.0	26.7	8.4	3.7	2.3	12.4	41.0	17.7	7.5	5.4	17.7	55.2	37.0	24.8	20.3	32.9				
Brazil	6.7	4.1	2.0	1.1	5.6	12.3	9.3	5.3	3.5	9.8	23.9	17.2	10.8	7.2	17.6	42.8	34.3	22.5	14.1	33.2				
Chile	5.8	2.4	0.5	0.0	3.2	8.5	5.1	2.0	0.9	4.8	16.7	9.6	4.1	2.3	8.2	34.1	22.8	15.9	13.8	19.7				
Colombia	22.0	11.6	3.7	1.3	16.2	38.2	29.2	16.7	6.9	28.1	–	–	–	–	–	70.8	66.8	55.4	35.0	63.0				
Costa Rica	19.5	8.0	2.6	1.9	13.3	26.9	15.4	6.5	1.6	15.8	–	–	–	–	–	50.5	27.3	16.9	8.8	27.2				
Ecuador	25.5	15.9	5.4	2.6	20.8	33.3	25.6	10.1	5.1	24.8	38.9	28.2	16.1	8.7	25.8	46.4	36.6	21.6	11.9	32.6				
Mexico	15.6	7.3	4.0	1.2	12.8	–	–	–	–	–	17.7	11.2	6.6	3.7	11.6	24.4	19.0	12.1	7.4	17.9				
Panama	75.5	48.2	12.6	3.4	52.8	77.3	51.5	18.3	5.7	46.9	75.9	57.8	31.9	14.2	46.6	81.0	68.1	43.7	19.3	56.1				
Women																								
Argentina	20.8	3.9	0.3	0.6	9.0	28.4	7.2	3.2	3.4	12.4	42.7	17.7	7.1	6.0	17.7	56.0	39.8	24.4	21.4	32.9				
Brazil	7.1	3.1	0.9	1.1	5.6	–	8.5	4.0	3.7	9.8	26.0	17.1	9.6	6.7	17.6	46.2	35.3	21.3	13.7	33.2				
Chile	5.8	1.9	0.3	0.0	3.2	9.2	4.7	1.6	0.6	4.8	18.8	9.7	3.5	2.8	8.2	34.3	23.4	15.5	13.3	19.7				
Colombia	23.2	7.4	0.9	0.8	16.2	42.0	27.3	11.0	4.8	28.1	–	–	–	–	–	73.2	68.4	55.5	33.4	63.0				
Costa Rica	20.2	7.3	0.6	2.4	13.3	31.5	13.6	3.4	1.7	15.8	–	–	–	–	–	54.3	27.5	15.6	7.2	27.2				
Ecuador	24.7	15.2	2.8	5.0	20.8	31.1	26.2	7.2	3.9	24.8	34.9	30.4	11.9	7.9	25.8	43.9	38.5	20.3	10.9	32.6				
Mexico	16.0	4.2	3.3	4.3	12.8	–	–	–	–	–	18.2	10.1	5.1	3.0	11.6	25.6	18.7	10.6	6.8	17.9				
Panama	76.5	44.7	7.4	1.2	52.8	78.1	51.0	15.2	5.9	46.9	77.7	59.2	28.3	12.5	46.6	82.6	69.5	44.8	17.6	56.1				

<Prim. less than primary, Prim. primary completed, Sec. secondary completed, Uni. university completed
 The calculations are based on Latin American census microdata samples from IPUMS-International

included 5.8 % of the unions among those who had not completed primary education.

Second, differences between educational groups have narrowed over time due to the rapid expansion of cohabitation among the higher educational levels. In all countries and for all educational groups, the probability of a man or woman cohabiting is higher in 2000 than in 1970. The odds ratios are systematically larger (results not shown here) for more highly educated people. For example, Table 2 shows that only 1.3 % of men who had completed secondary education cohabited in 1970 in Colombia. By 2005 (when the most recent census was conducted), this percentage had increased to 55.4 %. Similarly, in Argentina, the proportion among male college graduates increased from 0.7 % in 1970 to 20.3 % in 2001.

Third, differences across countries have also diminished over time. This decrease is observed both in overall levels of cohabitation (see Table 2) and in differences related to educational attainment. To illustrate this fact, we compare the range between the minimum and maximum values for the “less than primary” group in 1970 to the range of values observed for 2000. The range of values for men was almost 70 points between Panama and Chile in 1970, whereas the range observed between Panama and Mexico was only 55 points in 2000.

Log-Linear Models

To explore whether a gap in educational homogamy between prevailing married and cohabiting couples exists for Latin American countries, we estimate a series of log-linear models using the strategy outlined in the method section. Table 3 provides a description of each of the models and goodness-of-fit statistics. To assess fit, we use the *Likelihood Ratio Chi-squared statistic* (L^2) and the *Bayesian Information Criterion* (*BIC*), which is based on the L^2 statistic (Raftery 1986). *BIC* introduces a penalty term for the number of parameters in a model. Thus, it is possible to improve the fit of a model by adding more parameters, but if this adds unnecessary complexity, *BIC* will indicate a poorer fit.

Model 0 corresponds to the independence model because it lacks interaction between the educational attainment of males and females. This model only controls for the marginal distributions of the contingency table. Model 1 allows for unrestricted associations across countries and over time between the educational attainment of males and females, but it does not allow this association to differ for married and cohabiting couples. This model confirms that there is a strong association between male and female educational attainment. Our aim is to determine whether this association varies by type of union. Model 3 adds a homogamy parameter for each diagonal cell (*Hom*). We allow this parameter to vary by types of union, but it cannot vary over time and across countries. According to the *BIC* statistic, the fit of model 3 is significantly closer than that of model 2 ($BIC_{M3} - BIC_{M2} = -1,193$). This result indicates that the strength of homogamy varies by type of union and that there is a homogamy gap between married and cohabiting couples. Models 4 and 5 relax the constraints on the homogamy gap to enable this gap to vary over time and across countries, respectively. Compared with model 3, neither of these more complex models significantly improves the fit

Table 3 Specifications and goodness-of-fit statistics of log-linear models

Model design	Degrees of freedom	L^2	BIC
Independence			
1 TCUM, TCUF	576	1081531.0	1073077.7
Educational homogamy			
2 TCUM, TCUF, TCMF	288	2760.4	-1466.3
3 TCUM, TCUF, TCMF, HomU	286	1538.4	-2658.9
4 TCUM, TCUF, TCMF, HomTU	280	1457.7	-2651.5
5 TCUM, TCUF, TCMF, HomCU	272	1428.5	-2563.4
6 TCUM, TCUF, TCMF, HomTCU	224	1320.9	-1966.5

T (2) Time 1970–2000, *C* (8) Country Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, *U* (2) Type of Union Cohabiting union, Marriage, *M* (4) Male schooling Less than Primary, Primary Completed, Secondary Completed, University Completed, *F* (4) Female schooling Less than Primary, Primary Completed, Secondary Completed, University Completed, *Hom* (1) Homogamy parameter

according to the *BIC*; by this same criterion, model 5 fits more poorly than model 4. The less parsimonious fit of model 5 indicates that cross-country variations in the homogamy gap are less important than over-time variations. Finally, model 6 allows for unrestricted variation of the educational homogamy gap over time and across countries. According to L^2 , model 6 offers the best fit, but the *BIC* coefficient suggests that this model is inefficient when compared with model 3 due to the large loss of degrees of freedom, which means that differences across samples may not be large enough and statistically significant in all cases as to add extra parameters in the model even though the L^2 indicates a better fit. Nevertheless, in order to show in which samples the homogamy gap is statistically significant, we prefer to present the parameters from model 6 to obtain country- and time-specific parameters to estimate the homogamy gap. Had the models been done at the country level, the final parameters would have been exactly the same as in model 6.

The Homogamy Gap

Table 4 presents the homogamy gaps between married and cohabiting couples by country and census round. As described in the methods section, this gap corresponds to the difference in the strength of educational homogamy between the two types of unions. The coefficients are obtained from model 6. Similar parameters were found when we examined country-specific models. Nevertheless, we preferred to pool the data so that we could compare whether time trends were stronger than cross-country trends. If married and cohabiting couples present similar levels of educational homogamy, then the gap will be close to 0. Positive values indicate that married couples are more likely to be homogamous than cohabiting couples. Negative values indicate the opposite result. A 0.2 difference equals an odds ratio of 1.22 [$\exp(0.2) = 1.22$], which indicates that the strength (odds) of the homogamy net of the marginal distribution is 22 % larger for married couples than for cohabiting couples. In the [Appendix](#), we present data pertaining to the overall strength of

Table 4 Homogamy gaps between married and cohabiting couples (model 6) and the spread of cohabitation by country and census round

Country	Homogamy gap				% cohabitation				R Over time	p value
	1970	1980	1990	2000	1970	1980	1990	2000		
Argentina	0.22	0.17**	0.10**	0.01	9.0	12.4	17.7	32.9	-0.97	0.03
Brazil	0.21**	0.14**	0.15**	0.10**	5.6	9.8	17.6	33.2	-0.86	0.14
Chile	0.32 ⁺	0.11	0.08	0.07	3.2	4.8	8.2	19.7	-0.61	0.39
Colombia	0.26**	0.23**		0.16**	16.2	28.1		63.0	-1.00	0.03
Costa Rica	0.31	0.00		0.15	13.3	15.8		27.2	-0.19	0.88
Ecuador	0.35**	0.26**	0.22**	0.23**	20.8	24.8	25.8	32.6	-0.76	0.24
Mexico	0.23		0.17**	0.12**	12.8		11.6	17.9	-0.73	0.48
Panama	0.32	-0.01	0.07	0.17 ⁺	52.8	46.9	46.6	56.1	0.70	0.30
R Cross-national	0.43	-0.21	-0.20	0.35						
p. value	0.29	0.66	0.72	0.39						

Source the calculations are based on Latin American census microdata samples from IPUMS-International

The difference between the homogamy parameters for married and cohabiting couples corresponds to the *homogamy gap* ($\Delta\gamma_k^U$) between both types of union: $\Delta\gamma_k^U = \gamma_1^U - \gamma_2^U$, ($k = 1$ for married couples, $k = 2$ for cohabitating couples). To establish statistical significance for the *homogamy gap*, we have estimated confidence intervals for both γ_1^U and γ_2^U using three levels of statistical confidence (90, 95, 99 %). The following symbols indicate at which level the confidence interval does not overlap: ⁺ >90 %, * >95 %, ** >99 %

educational homogamy by type of union, country, and census round. This allows us to compare the magnitude of the homogamy gap with the levels of homogamy by educational attainment. Model 6 assumes that the homogamy gap is constant across all educational levels for each country and census round. Therefore, despite the fact that the strength of homogamy varies by educational attainment (higher homogamy at the ends of the educational hierarchy), the difference between married and cohabiting couples remains constant. In no case is the homogamy gap so high as to yield different patterns of assortative mating between married and cohabiting couples. Both types of union conform to a similar pattern of assortative mating: higher homogamy at the extremes of the educational hierarchy with a clear tendency to increase among the more highly educated groups.

On the other hand, results in Table 4 do show that married couples are more likely to be homogamous than cohabiting couples in all countries and samples except in Panama in 1980 and Costa Rica in 1984, in which no differences exist between the two types of couples. The homogamy gap diminishes between 1970 and 2000. In the 1970s, the gap was higher than 0.2 in all countries. Three decades later, only the gap in Ecuador (0.23) exceeded this threshold. The homogamy gap in Argentina decreased from 0.17 in 1980 to 0.01 in 2000. The level in 1970 was higher than in 1980, but not statistically significant.

The Relationship Between the Homogamy Gap and the Spread of Cohabitation

In addition to the homogamy gap, Table 4 shows the proportions of cohabiting couples by country and census round (as also shown in Table 1) and the correlation coefficients (R) between the size of the homogamy gap and the proportion of cohabiting couples. We estimate the correlation between years for each country and the correlation across countries for each census round. Despite the small number of observations, all countries except Panama show negative correlations. The years in which the homogamy gap was highest had the lowest proportions of cohabitation. Argentina and Colombia show strong and statistically significant correlations of -0.97 ($p < 0.05$) and -1.00 ($p < 0.032$), respectively. When we observe cross-national differences in a single year, the strength of the correlation is significantly lower and never statistically significant. Similar values for the homogamy gap are found for very different levels of cohabitation. This result can be observed in the cases of Chile and Panama in 1970. On the one hand, our findings do not invalidate the hypothesis that the size of the homogamy gap has decreased the most in countries that had the lowest levels of cohabitation in the 1970s (e.g., Argentina, Chile and Brazil), but on the other, these results do not provide strong support for it either. In some cases, the homogamy gap was not statistically significant despite pointing in the expected direction (e.g., Chile).

Discussion

In this paper, we have investigated differences in educational homogamy (termed the homogamy gap) between married and cohabiting couples in 8 Latin American countries from 1970 to 2000. The countries selected are among the most populous in the region and presented different levels of cohabitation in the early 1970s. Cohabitation has increased in all of these countries except Panama, where it has remained above 50 % during the entire period. Using data on young couples from the IPUMS census microdata samples, the log-linear models show that, despite strong tendencies toward homogamy among both married and cohabiting couples, the homogamy gap between the two types of unions was sufficiently large to yield better-fitting models when type of union was considered. The main results can be summarized as follows. Married couples are more likely to be homogamous than cohabiting couples. Despite the fact that the homogamy gap for all samples but one (Panama 1980) shows positive values, statistical significance is observed in scarcely 17 of 29 cases. The size of the homogamy gap decreased in all countries between 1970 and 2000. Time trends indicate that the homogamy gap is negatively correlated with the spread of cohabitation. Differences between countries have decreased, but such differences still persist. Countries with high levels of cohabitation do not necessarily have smaller homogamy gaps.

These results provide support for the three hypotheses outlined in the paper, but future research should attempt to provide more thorough verification of these results. We predicted that cohabiting unions would be less homogamous than marriages because of the weaker role of education in the partner markets in which cohabiting couples were formed than in those in which marriages were formed.

Consistent with this hypothesis, we have shown that cohabiting couples are less homogamous than married couples. Nevertheless, we have not provided a direct measure of the structuring role of education in the partner market. Our assumption was based on secondary sources that have reported extensively on the historical, cultural, and social roots of traditional cohabitation in Latin America (Charbit 1987; De Vos 1998; Rodríguez 2005). According to these sources, cohabitation was especially prevalent among the less educated, indigenous, African-descended, and isolated populations. Nevertheless, in the last few decades, cohabitation has spread among the higher social and educational groups. Cohabitation has abandoned its more traditional setting and entered partner markets that are increasingly similar to those for marriages. Rises in cohabitation have been observed not only among the better educated men and women, but also in countries and areas within countries that had low levels of traditional cohabitation four decades ago (Esteve et al. 2012).

These results lead us to the second hypothesis. The increase of cohabitation has reduced the homogamy gap between married and cohabiting couples; however, as predicted, differences between countries remain and are not correlated with their levels of cohabitation. As mentioned earlier, Latin American countries cannot be ordered in a continuum from traditional to modern societies based on their levels of cohabitation. Therefore, the process of comparing countries without employing a historical perspective may lead to flawed conclusions. A historical perspective is essential for understanding the dynamics of cohabitation in Latin America. Further, the third hypothesis predicted that the association between the homogamy gap and the level of cohabitation would be stronger in those countries in which cohabitation was less widespread in 1970 because the traditional and modern forms of cohabitation in such countries would be less mixed. Our results are consistent with this hypothesis: Argentina, Brazil, and Chile are the countries in which the homogamy gap was lowest in 2000 and are the countries that had the lowest levels of cohabitation in the 1970s. Nevertheless, despite the fact that coefficients measuring the homogamy gap support this claim, the absence of statistical significance in some cases advises caution.

Despite the existence of and trends in the homogamy gap conforming to the initial expectations of our research, a final question needs to be answered. Are these differences large and significant enough so as to talk to distinct patterns of assortative mating? As found in other studies, the size of the homogamy gap is relatively small compared to the magnitude of the overall levels of homogamy for both types of union. Thus, given the small size of the homogamy gap and the limitations of using cross-sectional data, results need to be interpreted with caution.

Our analysis is based on a set of prevailing young couples at the time of the census. Some men and women whose ages are similar to those considered here may have already ended previous relationships. Moreover, some couples that began cohabiting may already be married by the time of the census. In this regard, our results would also be consistent with the winnowing hypothesis (Blackwell and Lichter 2000, 2004), which predicts higher homogamy among married couples because couples with higher affinity (i.e., those who are homogamous) will be more likely to marry over time, while other couples separate or remain in less engaged union arrangements (i.e., dating and cohabiting couples). The data used in this research do not permit us to examine such cases, as recently done by Schwartz (2010) in the U.S. using longitudinal data

pertaining to couples. In the absence of longitudinal data that allow us to directly test these hypotheses, our results suggest that the winnowing hypothesis could also explain why marriages are more homogamous than cohabiting unions, but it may not explain why the homogamy gap has diminished over time. As we have mentioned in the data and methods section, from the scant but consistent evidence found in the region, we argue that the homogamy gap should have increased. Therefore, time trends in the homogamy gap should be explained by other factors, namely the generalization of cohabitation across all social groups in Latin America. In other words, our results are consistent with the idea that the contexts in which cohabitation and marriage emerge are increasingly similar.

This research has implications beyond Latin America. The historical perspective has clearly shown that the relationship between cohabitation and marriage is changing. This result provides support for one of the main arguments of the institutionalization hypothesis: Differences between married and cohabiting couples may change as the degree of institutionalization evolves in society (Kiernan 2002). The lack of historical data pertaining to cohabitation may have prevented researchers from conducting similar analyses of the situations in the U.S. or in Europe. The current analysis was facilitated by the availability of individual records organized by households in Latin American censuses since the 1970s and the ability of these censuses to identify cohabiting unions through the marital status question.

Future research will be necessary to examine additional evidence for the hypotheses outlined in this paper. Census microdata offer sufficient geographic details with which to compare regions within countries in the same way in which we have compared such data at the national level. For example, in countries such as Brazil and Colombia, non-marital cohabitation is not evenly distributed across regions, but regional differences have diminished due to the increase of cohabitation. We could predict that the homogamy gap should be higher in regions that were associated with the highest levels of cohabitation in the 1970s. The analysis could also involve specific subpopulations. We could compare ethnic and educational homogamy among indigenous populations who are less likely to marry. Research in this regard has shown that the tendency to marry or partner within the same educational group is lower among ethnic minorities (Esteve and López-Ruiz 2010). Demographic Health Survey data and country-specific surveys, such as the Mexican Retrospective Demographic Survey (EDER), could also provide more details regarding marital and union history to account for selectivity. Unfortunately, due to data availability and differences across countries, most of the suggested follow-up analyses will need to be conducted for specific countries and will thus lack the historical and cross-national perspectives of this paper.

Acknowledgments Funding for this research comes from the following projects ERC-2009-StG-240978, CSO2011-24544, 2009SGR00048, National Institutes of Health R01HD044154. The authors are very grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable and useful suggestions.

Appendix

See Table 5

Table 5 Homogamy parameters (log odds) for married and cohabiting couples, education, country, and year (Model 6)

Sample	Married couples				Cohabiting couples			
	Less than primary	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary	Less than primary	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary
Argentina								
1970	3.40	0.22	1.04	2.11	3.18	-0.01	0.82	1.88
1980	3.53	0.43	1.12	2.56	3.36	0.26	0.95	2.39
1991	3.66	0.50	0.97	3.03	3.56	0.41	0.87	2.94
2001	2.88	0.99	0.73	3.19	2.86	0.98	0.72	3.17
Brazil								
1970	3.91	0.60	1.00	2.83	3.70	0.39	0.79	2.62
1980	3.26	0.73	0.93	2.68	3.13	0.60	0.80	2.54
1991	2.81	0.86	0.89	2.62	2.66	0.70	0.74	2.47
2000	2.36	0.92	0.82	2.58	2.26	0.82	0.72	2.48
Chile								
1970	3.36	0.56	0.89	2.75	3.04	0.24	0.57	2.43
1982	2.49	0.79	0.81	2.55	2.37	0.68	0.70	2.44
1992	2.16	0.82	0.74	2.73	2.08	0.74	0.66	2.65
2002	2.45	0.93	0.56	3.41	2.38	0.86	0.49	3.35
Colombia								
1973	2.94	0.73	1.06	2.30	2.68	0.48	0.81	2.04
1985	3.05	0.76	0.84	2.77	2.82	0.53	0.61	2.53
2005	2.51	0.96	0.87	2.96	2.35	0.81	0.72	2.81
Costa Rica								
1973	2.99	-0.16	0.69	1.23	2.68	-0.47	0.38	0.92
1984	2.39	-0.16	0.66	1.83	2.38	0.14	0.66	1.83
2000	2.09	0.35	0.49	2.16	1.94	0.20	0.33	2.00
Ecuador								
1974	3.58	0.46	1.13	2.09	3.24	0.12	0.78	1.74
1982	3.37	0.57	1.12	2.09	3.11	0.31	0.86	1.83
1990	2.56	0.57	0.86	2.05	2.34	0.53	0.64	1.83
2001	2.04	0.94	0.78	2.02	1.81	0.71	0.55	1.79
Mexico								
1970	2.32	0.48	0.95	1.30	2.09	0.25	0.72	1.07
1990	2.87	0.54	1.03	2.19	2.70	0.37	0.86	2.02
2000	2.86	0.61	0.96	2.50	2.74	0.49	0.85	2.38
Panama								
1970	2.99	0.38	0.88	1.88	2.67	0.07	0.57	1.56
1980	2.50	0.38	0.61	1.96	2.51	0.28	0.62	1.97
1990	2.51	0.24	0.35	1.98	2.44	0.16	0.28	1.91
2000	2.17	0.46	0.54	1.83	2.00	0.29	0.37	1.66

Source the calculations are based on Latin American census microdata samples from IPUMS International

References

- Bernard, C., & Gruzinski, S. (1996). Children of the apocalypse: The family in meso-America and the Andes. In A. Burguière, C. Klapisch-Zuber, M. Segalen, & F. Zonabend (Eds.), *A history of the family* (pp. 165–215). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Blackwell, D. L., & Lichter, D. T. (2000). Mate selection among married and cohabiting couples. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21(3), 275–302.
- Blackwell, D., & Lichter, D. T. (2004). Homogamy among dating, cohabiting, and married couples. *Sociological Quarterly*, 45(4), 719–737.
- Blossfeld, H.-P., & Timm, A. (2003). *Who marries whom? Educational systems as marriage markets in modern societies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Brines, J., & Joyner, K. (1999). The ties that bind: Principles of cohesion in cohabitation and marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 64(3), 333–355.
- Cabella, W., Peri, A., & Street, M. C. (2004). Dos orillas y una transición? La segunda transición demográfica en Buenos Aires y Montevideo en perspectiva biográfica. Paper presented at the first congress of the Latin American population association (ALAP), Caxambu, Brazil, 18–20 September.
- Cabella, W. (2010). Los determinantes de la ruptura de la primera unión en el Uruguay: un análisis a partir de dos encuestas retrospectivas. *Revista Latinoamericana de Población*, 7, 31–56.
- Castro, T. (2002). Consensual unions in Latin America: Persistence of a dual nuptiality system. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 33(1), 35.
- Castro, T., & Martín, T. (2008). *Are women better-off in consensual unions or in marriages? An exploration of gender relations by union type in the Latin American context*. Presented at International Seminar on Changing Transitions to Marriage: Gender Implications for the Next Generation in Developing Countries (IUSSP), 10–12 September 2008, New Delhi, India.
- Charbit, Y. (1987). *Famille et Nuptialité dans la Caraïbe*. Paris: INED-PUF.
- Cherlin, A. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 848–861.
- De Vos, S. (1998). Nuptiality in Latin America. Working Paper 98-21. Wisconsin: Center for Demography and Ecology.
- England, P., & Farkas, G. (1986). *Households, employment and gender. A social, economic, and demographic view*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.
- Esteve, A., Lesthaeghe, R., & García, J. The family context of cohabitation and single motherhood in Latin America. *Population and Development Review* (forthcoming).
- Esteve, A., Lesthaeghe, R., & López-Gay, A. (2012). The Latin American cohabitation boom, 1970–2007. *Population and Development Review*, 38(1), 55–81.
- Esteve, A., & López-Ruiz, L. (2010). Union formation implication of race and gender gaps in educational attainment: The case of Latin America. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 29(5), 609–637.
- Esteve, A., & McCaa, R. (2007). Homogamia Educativa en México y Brasil, 1970–2000: Pautas y Tendencias. *Latin American Research Review*, 42(3), 56–85.
- Esteve, A., & Sobek, M. (2003). Challenges and methods of international census harmonization. *Historical Methods*, 36(2), 66–79.
- Fussell, E., & Palloni, A. (2004). Persistent marriage regimes in changing times. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(5), 1201–1213.
- García, B., & Rojas, O. L. (2002). Cambios en la formación y disolución de las uniones en América Latina. *Papeles de población*, 32, 11–31.
- Hamplova, D. (2009). Educational homogamy among married and unmarried couples in Europe does context matter? *Journal of Family Issues*, 30(1), 28–52.
- Hamplova, D., & Le Bourdais, C. (2008). Educational homogamy of married and unmarried couples in English and French Canada. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 33(4), 845–872.
- Heaton, T., Forste, R., & Otterstrom, S. (2002). Family transitions in Latin America: First intercourse, first union and first birth. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 8, 1–15.
- Kiernan, K. E. (2002). Cohabitation in Western Europe: Trends, issues, and implications. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Just living together: implications of cohabitation on families, children, and social policy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lesthaeghe, R. (1991). The second demographic transition in Western Countries: An interpretation. In K. O. Mason & A.-M. Jensen (Eds.), *Gender and family change in industrialized countries* (pp. 17–62). New York: Oxford University Press.

- López, L., Esteve, A., & Cabré, A. (2009). Uniones Consensuales y Matrimonios en América Latina: Dos Patrones de Homogamia Educativa? *Papeles de Población* 60:9–40.
- Manting, D. (1996). The changing meaning of cohabitation and marriage. *European Sociological Review*, 12(1), 53–65.
- Mare, R. D. (1991). Five decades of educational assortative mating. *American Sociological Review*, 56(1), 15–32.
- McCaa, R. (1994). Marriageways in Mexico and Spain, 1500–1900. *Continuity and Change*, 9(01), 11–43.
- McMeekin, R. (1998). Estadísticas Educativas de América Latina y el Caribe. Washington DC: UNESCO: Oficina Regional de Educación para América Latina y el Caribe.
- Mensch, B. S., Singh S., & Casterline, J. B. (2005). *Trends in the timing of first marriage among men and women in the developing world*. Working papers. New York: Population Council.
- Minnesota Population Center. (2011). *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, International: Version 5.0 (Machine-readable database)*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Pérez-Amador, J. (2008). Análisis multiestado multivariado de la formación y disolución de las parejas en México. *Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos*, 23(3), 481–511.
- Quilodran, J. (1992). La Vida Conyugal en América Latina: Contrastes y Semejanzas. In International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (Ed.), *El Poblamiento de las Américas* (pp. 245–264). Veracruz, MX: IUSSP.
- Quilodran, J. (1999). The free union in Latin America: Recent aspects of a secular phenomenon. *Cahiers québécois de démographie*, 28(1–2), 53–80.
- Quilodran, J. (2003). Efecto de la transición demográfica sobre la formación familiar. *Papeles de Población*, 9(37), 51–82.
- Raftery, A. E. (1986). Choosing models for cross-classifications. *American Sociological Review*, 51(1), 145–146.
- Rindfuss, R. R., & Vanden Heuvel, A. (1990). Cohabitation: A precursor to marriage or an alternative to being single? *Population and Development Review*, 16(4), 703–726.
- Rodríguez, J. (2005). Unión y Cohabitación en América Latina: Modernidad, Exclusión, Diversidad? In Serie. Población (Ed.), y *Desarrollo*. Santiago de Chile: CELADE.
- Rosero-Bixby, L. (1996). Nuptiality trends and fertility transition in Latin America. In J. M. Guzmán, S. Singh, G. Rodríguez, & E. A. Pantelides (Eds.), *The fertility transition in Latin America* (pp. 135–150). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schoen, R., & Weinick, R. M. (1993). Partner choice in marriages and cohabitations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 55(2), 408–414.
- Schwartz, C. R. (2010). Pathways to educational homogamy in marital and cohabiting unions. *Demography*, 47(3), 735–753.
- Schwartz, C. R., & Mare, R. D. (2005). Trends in educational assortative marriage from 1940 to 2003. *Demography*, 42(4), 621–646.
- Schwartz, C. R., & Mare, R. D. (2012). The proximate determinants of educational homogamy: The effects of first marriage, marital dissolution, remarriage, and educational upgrading. *Demography*, 49(2), 629–650.
- Shafer, K., & Zhenchao, Q. (2010). Marriage timing and educational assortative mating. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 41, 661–691.
- Smits, J., Ultee, W., & Lammers, J. (1998). Educational homogamy in 65 countries: An explanation of differences in openness using country-level explanatory variables. *American Sociological Review*, 63(2), 264–285.
- Soons, J. P. M., & Kalmijn, M. (2009). Is marriage more than cohabitation? Well-being differences in 30 European countries. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(5), 1141–1157.
- Torche, F. (2010). Educational assortative mating and economic inequality: A comparative analysis of three Latin American countries. *Demography*, 47(2), 481–502.
- UNESCO. (2006). *International Standard Classification of Education 1997*. New York: UNESCO.
- United Nations. (1990). *First marriage: Patterns and determinants*. New York: Naciones Unidas.
- Van de Kaa, D. (1988). Europe's second demographic transition. In *Population bulletin*. Washington DC: Population Reference Bureau.