Supplementary Tables for

"Searching for a Mate: The Rise of the Internet as a Social Intermediary"
Forthcoming in the American Sociological Review, 2012

By Michael J. Rosenfeld, Stanford University*

And

Reuben J. Thomas, The City College of New York

Draft Date: December, 2011

* Michael J. Rosenfeld, Department of Sociology, Stanford University, 450 Serra Mall, Stanford, CA 94305. Email: mrosenfe@stanford.edu. Web: www.stanford.edu/~mrosenfe

Appendix Table A1: How Americans Met their Spouses and Current Partners (percentages)

How Couple Met	Men married to Women	Unmarried Men partnered with Women	Women married to Men	Unmarried Women partnered with Men	Men partnered with Men	Women partnered with Women	Stat Sig.	Stat Sig same-sex couples vs. Hetero	Stat Sig men vs. women
Met Through Friends	36.8	33.1	36.3	38.3	19.7	26.0	***	***	
Met Through Family	17.4	14.0	22.0	15.0	0.1	7.7	***	***	**
Met Through Respondent's Own Family	9.0	7.9	15.5	10.9	0	0.8	***	***	***
Met as Coworkers	19.3	11.3	16.1	15.4	12.7	22.8	***		
Met at Bar, Club, or Restaurant	20.7	15.7	16.7	18.0	26.7	11.4	***		*
Met through Internet	4.5	13.8	3.6	10.0	27.3	24.1	***	***	
Met Through Work as Client	9.5	7.6	8.4	10.4	2.1	4.0		*	
Met in Primary or Secondary School	13.6	8.7	13.5	7.8	0	6.5	***	***	
Met in College	8.6	5.6	9.7	7.0	9.1	10.9	**		
Met through Church	7.0	2.9	9.5	2.6	1.5	1.3	***	***	
Met in Social Group, not Church	5.3	6.8	4.9	6.8	13.2	16.7	***	***	
Met in Neighborhood	9.6	5.7	11.0	12.1	10.9	4.7	**	**	
Blind Date	4.3	2.9	3.8	2.9	4.9	0.5	***	***	
Private Party	13.5	14.0	11.1	9.5	11.6	12.9			
In Public Place	5.9	14.3	9.1	10.2	5.9	4.7	***		
N	939	307	848	377	234	229			

Source: From How Couples Meet, Wave I, variables derived from question 24 (open text answer box: "How did you meet partner_name). N=2934, which excludes 49 refusals and 26 respondents who responded but did not provide a meaningful answer to Q24. Respondents are age 19 and higher. Averages are weighted by weight2. Unless otherwise specified, Friends, Family, and Coworkers can belong to either respondent or partner. Percentages don't add to 100% because more than one category can apply. Statistical Significance compares across all 6 groups, whereas GLB vs. Hetero and men vs. women compare across 2 groups.
*** P<0.001; ** P<0.01; * P<0.05

Appendix Table A2: The rise of the Internet as a way of meeting partners:
Percentage of couples who met via the Internet by recency of first meeting

When the Couple First Met	*Percentage who met online*			N of same-sex couples	Couple Distribution of When First Met (weighted percent)
	Hetero-sexual Couples	Same-Sex Couples	Total US (weighted Avg)		
within 2 years (2007-2009	21.5	61	23.2	72	11.9
3-5 years ago (2004-2006)	19.5	16	19.3	58	7.8
6-10 years ago (1999-2003)	10.7	23	10.9	91	16.9
11-15 years ago (1994-1998)	3.9	3	3.8	85	14.4
16-20 years ago (1989-1993)	2.2	1	2.1	55	10.5
21-30 years ago (1979-1988)	0.6	1	0.6	65	14.3
31+ years ago (1978 and earlier)	0.2	0	0.2	46	24.2
Total	6.7	23.7	7.1	472	100%
unweighted N	2,522	472			

Source: From How Couples Meet, Wave I, met via Internet indicated either on open-text q24 or itemized list q32 (variable either_internet_adjusted). Respondents are age 19 and higher. Averages are weighted by weight2. Years ago (when met) refers to time before the How Couples Meet survey, Wave I; survey was conducted in winter, 2009

Appendix Table A3: A lower bound for use of the internet as a way of meeting partners:
Percentage of couples who met via the internet by recency of first meeting, assuming respondents who did not
have internet access at home cannot have met online.

| When the Couple Met | *Percentage who met online* | | | N of same-sex couples | Couple Distribution of When First Met (weighted percent) |
	Hetero-sexual Couples	Same-Sex Couples	Total US (weighted Avg)		
within 2 years (2007-2009	17.3	54	18.9	72	11.9
3-5 years ago (2004-2006)	17.2	14	17.1	58	7.8
6-10 years ago (1999-2003)	9.9	20	10.1	91	16.9
11-15 years ago (1994-1998)	3.9	3	3.8	85	14.4
16-20 years ago (1989-1993)	1.4	1	1.4	55	10.5
21-30 years ago (1979-1988)	0.6	1	0.6	65	14.3
31+ years ago (1978 and earlier)	0.2	0	0.2	46	24.2
Total	5.8	20.9	6.1	472	100%
unweighted N	2,522	472			

Source: From How Couples Meet, Wave I, met via internet indicated either on open-text q24 or itemized list q32 (variable either_internet_adjusted). Respondents are age 18 and higher. Averages are weighted. Years ago (when met) refers to time before the How Couples Meet survey, Wave I; survey was conducted in winter, 2009

Appendix Table A4a: Partnership Rate Stable for US Women, age 30-44

Survey Year	Pct of Women who have a Male Partner
1982	88.8
1988	88.1
1995	87.6
2002	88.2
2006-8	87.5

Source: National Survey of Family Growth. Partnered women are either married, cohabiting with a man, or else have had sex with a man in the 3 months prior to the survey. For 2002 and 2006-08 NSFG, if sex in the last 3 months is calculated from partner dates rather than from most recent intercourse, the partnership rate would be slightly lower, 86.2% in 2002, and 86.7% in 2006-08. For comparison, the partnership rate for women age 30-44 in HCMST, wave I in 2009 was 82.1% (weighted by weight1).

Appendix Table A4b: Partnership rate in the US is flat 1995-2009, for adults age 30-49

year	A) Percentage married	B) Percentage with unmarried coresident partner	C=B+A) Percentage partnered
1995	69.6	3.3	72.9
1996	68.7	3.4	72.1
1997	68.3	3.6	71.9
1998	67.8	3.6	71.4
1999	67.6	4.1	71.7
2000	67.6	4.7	72.3
2001	67.7	4.8	72.5
2002	67.3	4.8	72.1
2003	67.1	4.8	71.9
2004	67.4	5.4	72.8
2005	67.0	5.4	72.4
2006	66.7	5.5	72.2
2007	67.2	5.6	72.8
2008	66.0	6.1	72.1
2009	66.2	6.0	72.2

Source: weighted data from March Current Population Surveys, via ipums.org.

Appendix Table A5: How Couples Met for Heterosexual Couples: Ever-Coresident versus Never-Coresident, For Couples who Met within 10 years of HCMST

	Ever Coresident	Never Coresident
Met Through Friends	35.8%	34.5%
Met Online	17.2%	17.0%
Met at Bar, Restaurant or Other Entertainment Space	16.7%	19.2%
Met Through Family	16.5%	8.2%*
Met as Neighbors	7.7%	5.9%
Met as Coworkers	15.0%	13.3%
Met in College	11.8%	8.6%
Met in Primary or Secondary School	5.1%	7.1%
Met in Church	8.1%	3.4%*
N	523	293

Source: Percentages are percentages of couples that met that way. From How Couples Meet, Wave I, q24. Respondents are age 19 and higher. Averages are weighted by weight2. Years ago (when met) refers to time before the How Couples Meet survey, Wave I; survey was conducted in winter, 2009. *** $P<0.001$; ** $P<0.01$; * $P<0.001$

Table A6 : Breakup rates not much influenced by How Couples Meet, With two (nearly identical) versions of the Adjusted Odds Ratio, Without and With children as an additional predictor

	One Year Breakup Rate (pct)	Raw Odds Ratio	Adjusted Odds Ratio (version 1)	Adjusted Odds Ratio (version 2)
Met Online (met within past 10 years)	15.6	0.86	0.68	0.69
Met Offline (met within past 10 years)	17.8			
Met Through Family				
Yes	8.7	1.01	1.24	1.25
No	8.7			
Met Through Friends				
Yes	9.6	1.20	1.41*	1.41*
No	8.1			
Met in a Bar/Restaurant				
Yes	7.3	0.81	0.95	0.96
No	9.0			
Met Through or As Neighbors				
Yes	7.6	0.86	0.94	0.94
No	8.8			
Met Through or as Coworkers				
Yes	6.3	0.66	0.66	0.66
No	9.2			
Met in College or University				
Yes	6.5	0.72	0.90	0.90
No	8.9			
Met in Primary or Secondary School				
Yes	5.2	0.55*	0.58	0.58
No	9.2			
Met in Church				
Yes	1.4	0.14**	0.27	0.27
No	9.2			

*** $P<0.001$; ** $P<0.01$; * $P<0.05$
Source: From How Couples Meet, Waves I and II, met via Internet indicated either on open-text q24 or itemized list q32, merged in the variable either_internet_adjusted. N=2,520 for individuals who responded to the 1 year follow-up survey. Excluding respondents whose partners were already deceased and excluding respondents who did not have a physical or sexual relationship with their partners at wave I yields an N of 2,429. Among these, 775 met within 10 years prior to wave I. Means weighted by weight2. Family, friends, neighbors, and coworkers may belong to either respondent or partner. Each of the odds ratios is computed via separate logistic regressions. Raw odds ratios take no other factors into account. Adjusted odds ratios control for respondent's marital status at wave I, coresidence with partner at wave I, respondent race and religion, and relationship duration. Version 2 of adjusted odds ratio adds presence of children at wave I as an additional predictor.

Appendix Table A7: Respondents with prior Internet Access at Home More Likely to have a Partner.
Odds Ratios Predicting the Likelihood of Having a Romantic Partner, from Logistic Regressions.

Attributes of the Respondent	M1	M2	M3	M4[a]
Prior Internet Access at Home	4.54***	1.97***	1.78***	2.62***
Age 18-24		0.58***	0.23***	0.13***
Age 25-34		1.71***	1.06	1.20
Age 35-44 (reference)				
Age 45-54		0.39***	0.31***	0.34***
Age 55-64		0.27***	0.22***	0.29***
Age 65-74		0.14***	0.19***	0.21***
Age 75+		0.07***	0.11***	0.03***
Female		0.75***	0.45***	0.76
Female × Age				
Age 18-24			4.82***	2.62**
Age 25-34			2.56**	1.22
Age 35-44 (reference)				
Age 45-54			1.32	0.97
Age 55-64			1.24	0.52
Age 65-74			0.46	0.18***
Age 75+			0.05*	---
Education (ref=HS degree)				
<HS			1.72**	1.84**
Some College			1.18	0.87
BA+			1.08	0.93
Gay, Lesbian or Bisexual			1.08	0.77
Race (ref=Non Hispanic White)				
Non Hispanic Black			0.80	0.62**
Non Hispanic Other			1.24	0.76
Hispanic			0.90	0.87
Religion (ref=Protestant)				
Catholic			1.71***	1.13
Jewish			0.63	0.56
Other			0.65	0.77
No religion			0.72*	0.61***

N	2490	2490	2480	2421
df	1	8	25	24
Likelihood Ratio Chisquare	294	545	682	629

Notes for Table A7.

a: Dependent variable is: respondent has a coresident partner.

Source: From How Couples Meet, Wave I. Respondents are age 19 and higher. Sample excludes 28 respondents whose text answers implied that their reported partner was deceased, and excludes all respondents who met their partner before 1995. Religion is respondent's religion at age 16. Averages are weighted by weight1.
*** $P<0.001$; ** $P<0.01$; * $P<0.05$, two tailed tests.

Appendix Table A8: Opposite Gender Partnership Rate a Strong Predictor for Own Use of Internet to Meet Partner. Logistic Regression Coefficients predicting Meeting Online, for Heterosexuals Who Met Partners in 2000-2009

| | For Male Respondents | | For Female Respondents | |
	M1	M2	M3	M4
Opposite Gender Partnership Rate (between 0 and 1)	3.20*	3.98**	1.79*	2.55**
Couple Longevity prior to 2009, in years		-0.157**		-0.023
Controls for Respondent Race		yes		yes
Controls for Respondent Education		yes		yes
Respondent had Prior Internet Access		0.59		1.01**
N	381	381	437	437
df	1	10	1	10
Likelihood Ratio Chisquare	6.29	25.82	5.76	20.84

Note: partnership rate is a 5 year moving average of each gender's actual partnership rate for ages 19-80, with linear extrapolation for ages 15-18, matched to respondent's age when respondent met partner.
*** P<0.001; ** P<0.01; * P<0.05, two tailed test