

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT to article in

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 70 (JUNE:541–562)

The Independence of Young Adults and the Rise of Interracial and Same Sex Unions

Michael J. Rosenfeld
Stanford University

Byung-Soo Kim
Stanford University

PART I: THE COMPARABILITY OF SAME SEX COUPLES FROM THE 1990 AND 2000 CENSUSES

The purpose of this supplement is to suggest that excluding dual marital status recodes from the 2000 U.S. census sample of same sex cohabiting couples yields a sample of same sex cohabiters that is more comparable with the 1990 census sample of same sex cohabiting couples. Table S1 shows that the same sex couples in 2000 had an extremely high rate of marital status recodes, 53% for either partner and 46.3% for both partners. This compares to 3.5% and 0.4% respectively for same sex couples in 1990, and similarly small percentages

for heterosexual cohabiting couples in 1990 and 2000.

For same sex couples in 2000 the rate of dual status recodes was very high compared to rate of either partner recodes- 87.3%. If the marital status recodes were the result of random and relatively uncommon forces like item non-response, we would expect to see dissonance between partners since random forces can effect either partner. A high correlation between the re-allocation of both partners suggests that more systematic changes were at work.

Table S1. Marital Status Re-Allocation for Same Sex Couples in the 1990 and 2000 U.S. Censuses

		1990	2000
A	Total Couples	173,842	669,984
B	Couples with at <i>Least One</i> Partner's Marital Status Re-Allocated	6,156	355,243
C	Couples with <i>Both</i> partners' Marital Status Re-Allocated	774	310,179
D=A-C	A More Comparable Count of Same Sex Couples: Same Sex Couples with Dual Marital Status Recodes Excluded	173,068	359,805
B/A	% of Couples with at <i>Least One</i> Partners' Marital Status Re-Allocated	3.5%	53.0%
C/A	% of Couples with <i>Both</i> Partners' Marital Status Re-Allocated	0.4%	46.3%
C/B	% of Re-allocated Couples that have <i>Both</i> Partners Re-Allocated	12.6%	87.3%
D/A	The More Comparable Count as a Percentage of the Total	99.6%	53.7%

Note: All data from weighted 5% microdata, 1990 and 2000 Censuses via IPUMS

Since the systematic recoding of couples from 'married' to 'partner' status was peculiar to the 2000 census, the exclusion of couples whose marital statuses were both re-allocated should yield a sample from the 2000 census that would be more comparable with the 1990 sample. If the couples whose marital statuses were both re-allocated are dropped from the samples, the 1990 sample is hardly changed but the 2000 sample is reduced from 669,984 to 359,805. If one uses the reduced dataset, the growth rate of same sex couples from 1990 to 2000 is reduced to 108% ($[359,805-173,068]/173,068$).

Dropping the dual marital status recodes from the 2000 sample of same sex couples is not by any means a perfect solution to the problem of non-comparability, and the procedure is not endorsed by the Census Bureau. The full 2000 sample of same sex couples is supposed to be the best available census data on the same sex cohabiting population. The problem is that the 1990 sample cannot be made more like the 2000

sample, so for comparisons between 1990 and 2000 the only option is making the 2000 sample more like the 1990 sample.

Table S2 compares the demographic profile for same sex couples in the 1990 census to the two alternative populations of same sex couples from the 2000 census. The middle column reports the profile of the reduced set of same sex couples with dual marital status recodes excluded (see the footnotes to Tables 3-5 and 8). The third column reports the profile of the full set of same sex cohabiting couples (see Tables 3-5 and 8). Table S2 shows that the reduced set of same sex couples from 2000 has a demographic profile that is closer to the 1990 sample of same sex couples in every case. This evidence supports the hypothesis that excluding the dual marital status recodes from the 2000 census sample of same sex couples yields a population of same sex couples that is more similar to the population of same sex couples from the 1990 census.

Table S2. Comparison of 2000 Same Sex Couples With and Without Marital Status Recodes to 1990 Sample of Same Sex Couples

Census Year	1990	2000	2000
Marital Status Recodes Excluded?	No	Yes	No
Same Sex Couple Demography (%)			
Geographic Mobility (Table 3)	67.5	55.9	51.7
Geographic Mobility for interracial same sex couples (Table 3)	74.4	71.7	64.1
Urban Concentration (Table 4)	56.6	43.7	37.3
Geographic Mobility in Rural Areas (Table 5)	54.1	56.3	46.6
Geographic Mobility in Suburban Areas (Table 5)	67.8	65.6	59.2
Geographic Mobility in Urban Areas (Table 5)	77.6	71.7	67.3
Interraciality (Table 8)	14.5	14.3	12.4

Note: Data from household weighted 5% files of the 1990 and 2000 census, via IPUMS, except central city status in 1990 is from the 1% files. All individuals are age 20-29, US born, except data from Table 5 is US born all ages. Geographic mobility is defined as either couple living in a different state from their birth state. Because the 1990 same sex data include so few couples with dual marital status recodes (< 1%), the demographic profile for same sex couples in 1990 is the same whether these couples are included or not.

PART II: ADDITIONAL TABLES THAT DESCRIBE MODELS SUMMARIZED IN TABLE 7 OF THE ASR ARTICLE

The following three tables provide all the coefficients for the models whose coefficient for geographic mobility and whose change in -2LL is presented in Table 7.

Table S3. Predictors of Inter-marriage with Asian Women for Married White Men in 2000, Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regressions

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Log Likelihood	-108,606	-106,600	-105,724	-101,246	-100,958
Δ -2LL		4,012	1,752	8,956	576
df	7	8	15	16	17
<i>Independent Variables:</i>					
Constant	.005***	.004***	.005***	.004***	.003***
Education					
<5 years	.45***	.46***	.65*	.69	.69
5-8 years	.26***	.27***	.38***	.43***	.44***
9	.33***	.34***	.40***	.43***	.44***
10	.42***	.42***	.47***	.50***	.50***
11	.39***	.40***	.42***	.44***	.43***
High School (reference)					
Some College	2.06***	1.87***	1.77***	1.64***	1.62***
BA or more	2.51***	2.05***	1.95***	1.68***	1.63***
Geographic Mobility		2.58***	2.69***	2.44***	2.44***
Age					
<20 (reference)					
20-29			.81	.92	.91
30-39			.95	1.08	1.08
40-49			.81	.93	.93
50-59			.69	.79	.79
60-69			.51*	.58	.58
70-79			.35***	.39***	.39***
> 80			.17***	.18***	.18***
Pct Asian Women in Metro				1.08***	1.08***
Live in City					1.70***

Note: This table is an expanded report of the logistic regression models which are summarized in Table 7 of the paper. Unweighted N of U.S. born married white men, 2,285,604. White and black are non Hispanic white and non Hispanic black, respectively.

Source Data: 2000 5% census microdata, via IPUMS. Logistic regression models use data weighted by household weights.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two tailed test).

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2005, VOL. 70 (JUNE:XXX-XXX)

Table S4. Predictors of Intermarriage with Hispanic Women for Married White Men in 2000, Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regressions

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Log Likelihood	-192,078	-191,227	-187,330	-174,977	-174,849
Δ -2LL		1,702	7,794	24,706	256
df	7	8	15	16	17
<i>Independent Variables:</i>					
Constant	.015***	.013***	.032***	.021***	.021***
Education					
<5 years	.70***	.70***	1.14	1.24*	1.24*
5-8 years	.36***	.37***	.59***	.69***	.69***
9	.67***	.67***	.83***	.90*	.90
10	.76***	.76***	.87***	.94	.94
11	.91*	.91***	.95	.97	.97
High School (reference)					
Some College	1.52***	1.45***	1.36***	1.20***	1.20***
BA or more	1.29***	1.17***	1.13***	.96***	.95***
Geographic Mobility		1.54***	1.64***	1.40***	1.41***
Age					
<20 (reference)					
20-29			.71***	.73**	.73**
30-39			.64***	.64***	.64***
40-49			.43***	.42***	.43***
50-59			.32***	.30***	.30***
60-69			.23***	.20***	.20***
70-79			.16***	.13***	.13***
> 80			.10***	.08***	.08***
Pct Hispanic Women in Metro				1.06***	1.06***
Live in City					1.30***

Note: This table is an expanded report of the logistic regression models which are summarized in Table 7 of the paper. Unweighted N of U.S. born married white men, 2,285,604. White and black are non Hispanic white and non Hispanic black, respectively.

Source Data: 2000 5% census microdata, via IPUMS. Logistic regression models use data weighted by household weights. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two tailed test).

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2005, VOL. 70 (JUNE:XXX-XXX)

Table S5. Predictors of Same Sex Cohabitation for Partnered Men in 2000, Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regressions

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Log Likelihood	-157,560	-157,303	-156,047	-153,937	-152,027
Δ -2LL		514	2,512	4,220	3,820
df	7	8	15	16	17
<i>Independent Variables:</i>					
Constant	.009***	.008***	.03***	.015***	.014***
Education					
<5 years	1.42***	1.42***	1.84***	1.85***	1.72***
5-8 years	.96	.97	1.24***	1.33***	1.32***
9	1.05	1.05	1.16**	1.20***	1.18***
10	1.08*	1.08*	1.14***	1.17***	1.15***
11	1.09*	1.10*	1.07	1.08	1.04
High School (reference)					
Some College	1.20***	1.17***	1.14***	1.07***	1.07***
BA or more	1.39***	1.31***	1.33***	1.18***	1.14***
Geographic Mobility		1.32***	1.37***	1.27***	1.28***
Age					
<20 (reference)					
20-29			.39***	.38***	.39***
30-39			.37***	.36***	.37***
40-49			.29***	.29***	.30***
50-59			.21***	.21***	.22***
60-69			.17***	.17***	.18***
70-79			.18***	.18***	.19***
> 80			.20***	.19***	.20***
Pct Gay Men in Metro				1.91***	1.81***
Live in City					2.52***

Note: This table is an expanded report of the logistic regression models which are summarized in Table 7 of the paper. Unweighted N's: married white men 2,285,604, partnered men (married and cohabiting men), 2,706,642. Adjusted odds ratios (dual marital status recodes excluded) for geographic mobility's influence on same sex cohabitation 1.59 (model 1), 1.71 (model 2), 1.58 (model 3), 1.60 (model 4), all statistically significant.

Source Data: 2000 5% census microdata, via IPUMS. Logistic regression models use data weighted by household weights. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two tailed test).