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.
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.
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 Intermarriage with Asian Women for Married White Men in 2000, Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ -2LL</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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***
- 2.60***
- 2.44***
- 2.44***

**Age**

- <20 (reference)
  - 20–29
  - .95
  - 1.08
  - 1.08
- 30–39
  - .81
  - .93
  - .93
- 40–49
  - .69
  - .79
  - .79
- 50–59
  - .51*
  - .58
  - .58
- 60–69
  - .35***
  - .39***
  - .39***
- > 80
  - .17***
  - .18***
  - .18***

**Pct Asian Women in Metro**

- 1.08***
- 1.08***
- 1.08***
- 1.08***

**Live in City**

- 1.08***
- 1.08***
- 1.08***
- 1.08***
- 1.08***

Notes:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>∆-2LL</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>7,794</td>
<td>24,706</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Variables:

- **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: .22*** .20*** .20***
  - 70–79: .16*** .13*** .13***
  - > 80: .10*** .08*** .08***
- **Pct Hispanic Women in Metro**: 1.06*** 1.06*** 1.06***
- **Live in City**: 1.36***

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood</td>
<td>−157,560</td>
<td>−157,303</td>
<td>−156,047</td>
<td>−153,937</td>
<td>−152,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ−2LL</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.009***</td>
<td>.008***</td>
<td>.03***</td>
<td>.015***</td>
<td>.014***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>1.42***</td>
<td>1.42***</td>
<td>1.84***</td>
<td>1.85***</td>
<td>1.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–8 years</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.24***</td>
<td>1.33***</td>
<td>1.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.16**</td>
<td>1.20***</td>
<td>1.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.08*</td>
<td>1.08*</td>
<td>1.14***</td>
<td>1.17***</td>
<td>1.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.09*</td>
<td>1.10*</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (reference)</td>
<td>1.20***</td>
<td>1.17***</td>
<td>1.14***</td>
<td>1.07***</td>
<td>1.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>1.39***</td>
<td>1.31***</td>
<td>1.33***</td>
<td>1.18***</td>
<td>1.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA or more</td>
<td>1.23***</td>
<td>1.37***</td>
<td>1.27***</td>
<td>1.28***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Mobility</td>
<td>1.23***</td>
<td>1.37***</td>
<td>1.27***</td>
<td>1.28***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20 (reference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–69</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–79</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 80</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Gay Men in Metro</td>
<td>1.91***</td>
<td>1.91***</td>
<td>1.81***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.52***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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).