SEXUAL MINORITIES AND SOCIAL CONTEXT: AN EXAMINATION OF UNION FORMATION, LABOR MARKET OUTCOMES, AND COMING OUT

Barbara F. Prince

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2018

Committee:

Kara Joyner, Advisor

Laura Landry-Meyer Graduate Faculty Representative

Susan L. Brown

Karen Benjamin Guzzo

Wendy D. Manning

© 2018

Barbara Prince

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Kara Joyner, Advisor

The past two decades have been a time of rapid social change for sexual minority individuals living in the United States. Marriage for same-sex couples is now legally recognized in all states and the number of adults identifying as lesbian, gay, or bisexual is at an all-time high. Nevertheless, certain rights are still not afforded to all sexual minorities, and stressors exist beyond the legal and institutional context. Social context is salient for sexual minorities because they are likely to encounter stressful situations in their neighborhoods, workplaces, and families. Previous research has examined the effects of context on the health and well-being of sexual minorities, but has rarely analyzed contextual influences on other outcomes for this population. The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) provides the unique opportunity to examine how different indicators of social context are associated with a variety of outcomes for a nationally representative cohort of young adults in the United States. Using data from Add Health, I first examine how indicators of social context are associated with the likelihood that sexual minorities (i.e., homosexuals and bisexuals) have come out to parents prior to Wave III. Second, I examine how indicators are associated with their likelihood of forming a same-sex coresidential union between Wave III and IV. Third, I consider how sexual minorities fare in the labor market in comparison to sexual majorities (i.e., heterosexuals) at Wave IV, paying close attention to how their outcomes also differ according to relationship context. In support of minority stress and ecological systems frameworks, I find evidence that social context matters for sexual minorities. Specifically, sexual minorities living in census tracts with relatively moderate or high concentrations of same-sex couples are more likely to be out to

either parent than their counterparts living in tracts with low concentration of same-sex couples. Sexual minorities who are out to their parents are more likely to form a same-sex union than those who are not out. In addition, sexual minority men (but not women) living in neighborhoods with more same-sex couples have a higher likelihood of forming a same-sex union than their counterparts living in neighborhoods with fewer same-sex couples. Consistent with prior research based on Add Health, bisexual men and women (but not homosexual men and women) have significantly lower hourly wages than their heterosexual counterparts. My analyses demonstrate that associations between sexual orientation identity and wages are complicated by union status. Most notably, the bisexual wage penalty largely reflects the fact that bisexual men and women are less likely than their heterosexual counterparts to be married. My results also suggest that conclusions about the success of sexual minorities in the labor market relative to sexual majorities differ depending on whether the outcome is any employment, full-time employment, or hourly wages. The findings of this dissertation extend prior research and provide new insights into the links between social context and sexual minority outcomes. This dissertation is dedicated to teenage Barbara, and all those like her, who was deep in the closet, self-harming, a raging alcoholic, and truly believed it would always be that way. Find the

team. It gets better.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As my graduate school education and dissertation writing process comes to an end there are numerous people I would like to thank. There are no words to convey my gratitude and appreciation for Dr. Michele Lee Kozimor-King, but I will try. Koz was the first academic to truly challenge me and push me to be a better writer, teacher, and scholar. After excelling in high school as an "excellent writer", Koz (rightfully) failed and ripped apart the first introduction I ever gave her in Research Methods. She would not accept crap writing or presenting, nor did she tolerate excuses. Although I did not take it well at the time, this feedback transformed the way I approach academic work to this day. My academic socialization and success all started and continues because of her. Koz was and is quick to find opportunities for me and has always allowed me to shine. I was not easy to work with (especially as an entitled undergraduate student) but she has never given up on me. She pushes me out of my comfort zone, celebrates my successes, and mourns my losses. She is the epitome of mentor, teacher, and friend. I deeply humbled and grateful to be able to call her all three. I can only hope to be a fraction of the mentor she has been. I am deeply honored to be the first undergraduate student she has ever mentored to receive a Ph.D and so grateful she took me on as a mentee in the first place. Thank you, Koz, for being a light even on the darkest of days.

Next, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Kara Joyner. I remember vividly receiving an email saying simply "Prince will work with Joyner" the summer before I started graduate school at BGSU. At the time I had no idea how much that would shape my graduate school experience. I know most people have horror stories from graduate school, but I honestly have none. Kara is everything you could ask for in an advisor and mentor. She is brilliant, patient, kind, and excellent at pointing out mistakes without making you feel like an idiot (for example, "maybe you should double check that"). She is supportive and affirming,

vi

while also pushing for excellence. Even though I am sure there were many times she wanted to kill me, I could never tell. I never felt like a brain on a stick while working with Kara. I always felt seen and heard, and I will forever be grateful.

I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to Dr. Wendy D. Manning. During my very first meeting with Kara back in 2014 she mentioned that "next week Wendy Manning will be joining us" and it has been that way ever since. It has been a honor to watch Kara and Wendy work together as well as to have their expertise, support, and ideas for my own work. Getting to meet weekly with the President of PAA and having her give feedback on my work was a truly special and once in a lifetime experience that was not lost on me. I am grateful I was able to be one of her students and co-authors. I also appreciated her humor, honesty, and encouragement.

Next, I would like to thank Dr. Susan L. Brown. I knew of Susan Brown within one month of declaring Sociology/Anthropology as my undergraduate major and heard about her, and her work, often throughout my undergraduate career. There are still times that I cannot believe I got to take class with and interact on an almost daily basis with THE Susan Brown. Having dinner at her house remains one of my absolute favorite and most special moments in graduate school. Immense respect for Susan, as well as her intensity, pushed me to make this dissertation the absolute best it could be. Thank you, Susan.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr. Karen Benjamin Guzzo for her thorough feedback on my dissertation, both conceptually and methodologically. Karen's feedback has helped me develop this dissertation more fully and will inform my work as I move these chapters forward for publication. I would also like to thank Dr. Laura Landry-Meyer for her time and comments and for pushing me to think more about theory.

There are many others who have helped me along the way as well. First, thank you to Ms. Lori Fritsch, social studies teacher at Seaford High School. I took "SUPA Sociology" with her my senior year (2007-2008) and it completed transformed the way I saw the world and my path in life. When I enrolled in her class I had no clue what sociology even was, and now I have three degrees in it. Thank you Ms. Fritsch. Thank you also to the Etown turned BGSU crew (aka "Koz kids"): Marshal, Lindsey, Miranda, Justina, Amira, and Eric. When I took my first undergraduate sociology course (Research Methods) with Marshal back in 2009 I never EVER thought we would be graduating with our PhDs the same time. Marshal has challenged and pushed me to become a better scholar and friend. It has been a wild ride. Special thank you also to Miranda who kept me fed and caffeinated, and fed Luna whenever I was out of town, as I finished up writing this dissertation. It was very much appreciated. I now pass the torch to you and the other Koz kids.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to those who came before me in this program, specifically Bart and Matt. They both lead by example and were always there to listen and help. I would also like to thank my friends from high school, Anthony and Caroline, who helped give me perspective as I completed graduate school. When I wished I was with them, living my life in the city, going to brunch, meeting Broadway stars and famous drag queens, they helped remind me how impressive and special it was to be getting a PhD. Thank you also to my fellow graduate students for their humor and camaraderie. It would have been a dull road without you. I, of course, also need to thank my ride or die friends, Phil and Caitlyn. Thanks for always lifting me up, making me laugh even in a crisis, and being willing to drop everything to help. I am beyond lucky to have them in my life. Thank you also to Dr. Trenton Mize for posting his Stata coding on his website.

The process of graduate school and writing this dissertation have also allowed me to experience some huge personal transformation. When I started graduate school at West Virginia University, I never would have openly studied sexual minorities because of a fear of being outed myself. Even after I started here at BGSU I was so afraid of anyone knowing I was gay. However, as I sat at a talk by Jim Obergefell, surrounded by my fellow graduate students and faculty from this department, I became very aware that this is the most supportive social context I have ever been in and may ever be in again. Their open support for and championing of gay rights gave me the courage to live my own truth. So thank you to everyone who has been part of my "social context" while at BGSU. You have allowed me to more fully claim my own story.

I also experienced two significant losses over the last seven months of writing this dissertation. First, in November 2017, my dad passed away unexpectedly from cancer. Since his death, I have been approached and sent messages from his friends telling me how much he bragged about me and how proud he was of my dreams and goals. Shortly before I defended my dissertation I found a letter he had sent me the day he dropped me off for college. He never read my dissertation, nor did we ever talk about it, but I am grateful for these messages from his letter and friends. Then, in March 2018, my grandma passed away a week shy of her 96th birthday. When I had last sat down and talked with her at Christmas she was so excited for my graduation and my job as an Assistant Professor. I will be forever grateful for her example of how to be independent, fierce, and not take crap from anyone.

Of course I would also like to thank my cats, Zelda and Luna, and "my" other cats Manee and Dennie who love unconditionally and were always there for me (not that they really had a choice). They don't care about homosexuality, deadlines, or advanced statistical analysis. All they care about are treats and being pet. We could all learn from them. Finally, thank you to Monster Energy Drinks, without which I would not have been able to write this document.

This research was supported by funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (1R15HD070098-01A1). It was also supported in part by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24HD050959-07). The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are solely those of the author(s) and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the Federal government. This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II. DEMOGRAPHICS, SOCIAL CONTEXT, AND DISCLOSURE OF	
SEXUAL ORIENTATION IDENTITY	7
Background	9
Defining coming out	9
Coming out to parents	10
Differences in coming out: Bisexuality	12
Differences in coming out: Race	14
Differences in coming out: Age and gender	14
Context and coming out	16
Current Study	18
Data and Methods	18
Analytic Sample	19
Dependent Variable	19
Out to parents	19
Independent Variables	20
Bisexuality	20
Race	20
Gender	20
Contextual Variables	20
Same-sex couple concentration	20
Region	21

Family Variables	. 21
Living with two biological parents	. 21
Family SES	. 21
Parental closeness	. 21
Living with parents	21
Control Variables	. 21
Age at wave III	. 22
Geographic mobility	. 21
Religiosity	22
Analytic Strategy	. 22
Results	23
Descriptive results	. 23
Multivariate results	. 24
Supplemental analyses	. 31
Discussion	. 33
CHAPTER III. SEXUAL MINORITIES, SOCIAL CONTEXT, AND UNION	
FORMATION	. 47
Background	. 48
Union formation in young adulthood	. 48
Same-sex union formation	. 50
Family context: Out to parents	. 53
Demographic context: Same-sex couple concentration	. 54
Attitudinal context: Republican voting	. 56
Current Study	. 56

Data and Methods	57
Analytic sample	57
Dependent Variable	58
First same-sex coresidential union formation	58
Independent Variables	59
Sexual minority status	59
Contextual Variables	60
Out to either parent	60
Same-sex couple concentration	60
County-level voting	61
Control Variables	61
Age at wave III	61
Race/Ethnicity	62
Living with two biological parents	62
Family SES	62
Migration	62
Analytic Strategy	62
Results	63
Descriptive results	63
Multivariate results	65
Supplemental analyses	66
Discussion	68
CHAPTER IV. SEXUAL MINORITIES, RELATIONSHIP CONTEXT, AND THE	
LABOR MARKET	76

xiii

Background	
Wage penalties, premiums, and discrimination	77
Sexual minorities and wages	79
Sexual minorities and employment	84
Current Study	86
Data and Methods	88
Analytic sample	88
Dependent Variables	89
Employment status	89
Wages	89
Independent Variables	89
Sexual orientation identity	89
Couple types	90
Control Variables	90
Age	90
Race	90
Education	91
Student status	91
Relationship status	91
Region	91
Hours worked	91
Occupational category	91
Analytic Strategy	92
Results	92

xiv

Descriptive results – employment	92
Multivariate results – employment	98
Descriptive results – wages	102
Multivariate results – wages	109
Supplemental analyses	113
Discussion	115
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION	134
Contributions and Key Findings	135
Limitations	140
Implications and Future Research	142
Conclusion	145
REFERENCES	146
APPENDIX A: SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES FOR CHAPTER II	178
APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES FOR CHAPTER III	181
APPENDIX C: SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES FOR CHAPTER IV	183

XV

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
3.1	Same-Sex Union Formation	73
4.1	Predicted Values for Employment: Men	131
4.2	Predicted Values for Employment: Women	131
4.3	Predicted Values for Full-Time Employment: Men	132
4.4	Predicted Values for Full-Time Employment: Women	132
4.5	Predicted Values for Wage: Men	133
4.6	Predicted Values for Wages: Women	133

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Descriptive Statistics for Out to Either Parent	40
2.2	Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent	41
2.3	Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent: Men	42
2.4	Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent: Women	43
2.5	Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent:	
	Homosexuals	44
2.6	Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent:	
	Homosexual Men	45
2.7	Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent:	
	Homosexual Women	46
3.1	Descriptive Statistics by Sex and Sexual Identity for Same-Sex Union	
	Formation	74
3.2	Hazard Ratios from Cox Models of First Same-Sex Union: Sexual Minority	
	Respondents	75
4.1	Descriptive Statistics for Employment	121
4.2	Descriptive Statistics for Employment by Couple Type for Men	122
4.3	Descriptive Statistics for Employment by Couple Type for Women	123
4.4	Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Employment by Identity	124
4.5	Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Employment by Couple Type	125
4.6	Descriptive Statistics for Wages	126
4.7	Descriptive Statistics for Wages by Couple Type for Men	127
4.8	Descriptive Statistics for Wages by Couple Type for Women	128

4.9	OLS Regressions for Log Hourly Wages: Identity	129
4.10	OLS Regressions for Log Hourly Wages: By Couple Type	130

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The past two decades have been a time of rapid social change for sexual minorities¹ living in the United States. For example, prior to 1997, no states legally recognized same-sex unions, only nine states provided employment discrimination protection for all employees on the basis of sexual orientation, and only 17 states addressed hate crimes based on sexual orientation. Furthermore, as of June 2018, 23 states provide employment discrimination protection on the basis of sexual orientation and 30 states have hate crime laws which include lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) individuals in their list of protected classes (Human Rights Campaign 2018). Today, based on the 2015 United States Supreme Court ruling on *Obergefell v. Hodges*, marriage for same-sex couples is legally recognized in all states.

Attitudes toward sexual minorities have become increasingly more positive. Based on General Social Survey data, the number of adults in the United States who felt that a sexual relationship between two adults of the same sex was "always wrong" fell from 75 percent in 1987 to less than half (43.5 percent) in 2010 (Smith 2011). In addition, the number of adults in the United States identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender has increased in recent decades. Over 11 million adults in the United States, or 4.5 percent of the population, identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) (Newport 2018). This represents a one percent point increase between 2012 and 2017 alone (Newport 2018). Virtually all of this increase is driven by Millennials, who are more than twice as likely as any other generation to identify as LGBT (Newport 2018).

¹ The term sexual minority typically refers to an individual who identifies as gay, lesbian, or bisexual (Frost and Meyer 2012), reports same-sex attraction (Russell, Seif, and Truong 2001), reports same-sex sexual behavior (Goodenow, Szalacha, and Westheimer 2006), or living with a same-sex partner (Poston and Rollman-Tinajero 2018).

Despite these changes, challenges still exist for sexual minorities. For example, approximately 60 percent of the population still lives in a jurisdiction that does not provide employment discrimination protection on the basis of sexual orientation (Human Rights Campaign 2017) and nearly twenty percent of hate crimes reported in 2015 were attributed to sexual orientation (Federal Bureau of Investigation 2015). The social context is salient for sexual minorities because of stressors and experiences associated with their identity such as discrimination and harassment (Goldberg and Sayer 2006; Meyer 1995; Meyer 2003). While a wealth of research has examined how social context is related to health outcomes for sexual minorities (e.g., Duncan and Hatzenbuehler 2014; Everett 2014; Hatzenbuehler, Keyes, and Hasin 2009; Hatzenbuehler et al. 2010), research on other outcomes such as union formation and employment is limited.

The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) provides the unique opportunity to examine how social context, defined broadly, is associated with these outcomes among a nationally representative cohort of young adults in the United States. Add Health follows a 1994-1995 cohort of 7-12th graders from the time they are in middle school/high school through to adulthood. Add Health was originally designed to "help explain the causes of adolescent health and health behavior with special emphasis on the effects of multiple contexts of adolescent life" (Harris 2013: 2). Given the focus on context, Add Health was set up to examine various social contexts including school, family, and peer, as well as community contexts. According to Harris (2013). "these contextual factors operate at one or more ecological levels, from micro to macro, and range from intimate to broad contexts that capture psychosocial factors, factors that affect health both narrowly- and broadly-defined and elements of the built environment" (p. 15).

The goals of this dissertation are to examine how social context is associated with (1)coming out to parents (2) same-sex union formation, and (3) employment and wages among sexual minorities using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health. First, in Chapter II, I examine how demographic and contextual factors are associated with coming out to parents among those who identify as sexual minorities. Coming out, or disclosing one's sexual orientation identity, is found to be one of the most stressful experiences for sexual minority individuals (Hershberger, Pilkington, and D'Augelli 1997; Maslowe and Yarhouse 2015; Maugen et al. 2002; Rotheram-Borus et al. 1995; Scherrer et al. 2015). However, previous research has been largely psychological (see Orne 2011), qualitative (Oswald 1999; Scherrer et al. 2015; Newman and Muzzonigro 119; Bry et al. 2017; Guittar 2011), used clinical and convenience samples (see Oswald 1999; Heatherington and Lavner 2008), and examined sexual minorities as a homogenous group (see Scherrer et al. 2015). Therefore, in Chapter II, I examine how demographic and contextual factors (e.g., same-sex couple concentration, parental closeness) are associated with the likelihood that sexual minorities have disclosed their sexual orientation identity to their parents by Wave III.

Second, in Chapter III, I examine how sexual orientation identity is associated with timing and likelihood of same-sex union formation. I also examine how indicators of supportive social context (i.e. same-sex couple concentration, Republican voting, being out to either parent) are associated with the likelihood of same-sex union formation, specifically for sexual minorities. To my knowledge, the only study to have examined the timing and likelihood of same-sex union formation is a dissertation based on data from the 1920 British Cohort Study and National Child Development Study (Strohm 2010). This study was unable to limit the at risk group to individuals who identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. Studies have yet to examine same-sex union formation or how context is associated with same-sex union formation in the United States. Thus, in Chapter III I examine the likelihood of same-sex union formation among sexual minorities between Waves III and IV.

Third, in Chapter IV, I focus on how sexual minorities fare in the labor market in comparison to sexual majorities by examining employment and wages. Sexual minorities are one of the largest, but least studied, minority groups in the workforce (Ragins 2014; Ozeren 2014). Like other minority groups, they face an elevated risk of experiencing discrimination and stigmatization within the labor market (e.g., Badgett et al. 2007; Day and Schoenrade 2000; Ozeren 2014). Previous research has focused heavily on how sexual minority status is associated with wages but have overlooked employment. Previous research also documents a wage premium for lesbian women and a wage penalty for gay men (see Klawitter 2015), with bisexual men and women facing the largest penalty (Mize 2016). However, previous research has not fully considered the influence of relationships context on wages. In addition, the most recent analysis of wages using Add Health data (Mize 2016) only considers relationship context as a control variable and limits the categories to marriage and cohabitation (without regard for sex composition of the couple). In Chapter IV, I use two measures of sexual minority status (identity and coresidence) to bridge the gap in previous research by examining how relationship context (type and sex composition of couple) mediates and moderates the association between sexual orientation and labor market outcomes at Wave IV.

The two main theoretical frameworks guiding this dissertation are the minority stress framework (Meyer 1995; Meyer 2003) and ecological systems theory (Brofenbrenner 1988). Meyer (1995) states that sexual minorities, like racial minorities, experience greater levels of stress due to not only to their stigmatized identity, but also their more inhospitable social environments (Frost and Meyer 2009; Meyer 2003). Therefore, it is expected that sexual minorities will have worse outcomes, overall, compared to the sexual majority (i.e., heterosexuals). Importantly, the minority stress framework suggests that sexual minorities will experience less stress in contexts where they enjoy more social and institutional support (less structural stigma) (Frost and Meyer 2009). For example, sexual minorities living in communities with high levels of anti-gay prejudice experience a higher hazard of mortality than those living in communities with low levels of prejudice (Hatzenbuehler et al. 2014). Similarly, high state level structural stigma is significantly associated with increased sexual risk behavior among men who have sex with men (Oldenburg et al. 2015). Felson and Adamczyk (2017) found using data from the New York City Community Health Survey that disparities in psychological distress between heterosexuals and sexual minorities were smaller in areas known to be beacons of gay subculture (e.g., the West Village) than in other places.

Researchers have conceptualized stigma and interventions to reduce it using Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems framework (Cook, Purdie-Vaughns, Meyer, and Busch 2014). Bronfenbrenner (1988)'s ecological model framework explains that individual development occurs within multiple and interacting contexts, with influences ranging from macrolevel settings (attitudes and ideologies of the culture), to microsystem settings (family, work, peers, school) (Bronfenbrenner 1988; Goldberg and Sayer 2006). Ecological theory suggests that individuals in more supportive contexts (e.g., high concentrations of same-sex couple households) will experience more positive outcomes (e.g., union formation) while individuals in less supportive contexts (e.g., low levels of parental closeness) will experience more negative outcomes (e.g., not being out to either parent). Taken together these frameworks suggest that, without taking into account context, sexual minorities should have worse outcomes than the sexual majorities. Previous research has found in societies intolerant of homosexuality, individuals in same-sex unions have lower well-being than individuals in different-sex unions, whereas they fare better in tolerant societies (Fisher, Kalmijn, and Steinmetz 2016). Therefore, I expect to find more positive outcomes among sexual minorities living in supportive contexts, than those in less supportive contexts.

This dissertation contributes to existing literature on sexual minorities by: 1) examining coming out to parents, union formation, and labor market outcomes among a nationally representative sample of young adults in the United States; 2) capitalizing on the richness and longitudinal nature of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health data to analyze contextual influences on behaviors of sexual minorities; 3) investigating the association between coming out, union formation, wages, and employment, and a wide range of demographic and contextual factors; 4) drawing on the minority stress and ecological system theories framework to understand the experiences of sexual minority young adults during a time of rapid social change and 5) expanding our overall understanding of well-being of sexual minorities in young adulthood. I conclude this dissertation with a chapter that summarizes the findings from the analytic chapters, highlights the implications of the results, and discusses next steps in future research on social context and sexual minority outcomes.

CHAPTER II. DEMOGRAPHICS, SOCIAL CONTEXT, AND DISCLOSURE OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION IDENTITY

Coming out to family and friends is found to be one of the most stressful processes faced by lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) individuals (Hershberger, Pilkington, and D'Augelli 1997; Maslowe and Yarhouse 2015; Maugen et al. 2002; Rotheram-Borus et al. 1995; Scherrer et al. 2015). Sexual minority individuals spend large amounts of energy deciding where, when, how, and to whom they will disclose their sexual orientation (Alpaslan, Johnston, and Goliath 2009). They evaluate the costs and benefits of coming out with all individuals and institutions in their lives (Maugen et al. 2002; Ryan et al. 2015; Scherrer et al. 2015). As Maguen, Floyd, Bakeman, and Armistead (2002) note, it is important to understand how sexual minorities "overcome the impulse to hide and, instead, begin to disclose to significant people in their lives" (p. 220).

Coming out has been linked to consequences that are both positive (Cain 1991; Feldman and Wright 2013; Jordan and Deluty 1998; Ragins 2004; Rostosky and Riggle 2017; Wells and Kline 1987) and negative (D'Augelli 2002; D'Augelli and Grossman 2001; Diamond and Lucas 2004; Feldman and Wright 2013; Kosciw et al. 2014). For example. D'Augelli and Grossman (2001) found that the more open participants were about their sexual orientation, and the less time they spent before disclosing their identity, the more victimization they reported. Conversely, Jordan and Deluty (1998) found that lesbian women who were out had less anxiety, more positive affectivity, and greater self-esteem than lesbian women who were not out. Corrigan and Matthews (2003) summarized the benefits of coming out as increased self-esteem, decreased distress, diminished risky behaviors, facilitation of interpersonal relationships and enhanced relatedness to key institutions, like work (p. 214). Negatives consequences of coming out include physical harm, social avoidance by others, social disapproval, and self-consciousness (Corrigan and Matthews 2003). Previous research has also examined how parental and peer reactions to coming out are associated with various outcomes (Puckeet et al. 2017; Rosario, Schrimshaw, and Hunter 2009; Ryan, Legate, and Weinstein 2015; Starks, Newcomb, and Mustanski 2015). For example, Rosario et al. (2009) found that the number of disclosures was not associated with alcohol or substance use, but the number of negative reactions an individual received after coming out was associated with alcohol, cigarette, and marijuana use. Similarly, Ryan et al. (2015) found that a negative, but not positive, reaction to first coming out had a lasting impact on well-being.

The Pew Research Center's (2013a) survey of over 1000 LGBT adults provides one of the only large scale, nationally representative, examinations of the coming out experience in the United States (Lopez 2013). According to the report, over half (56 percent) of respondents said they told their mother about their sexual orientation or gender identity, while only 39 percent have told their father (Pew Research Center 2013a). Gay men report reaching all coming out milestones (first thought you were LGB, knew for sure you were LGB, and told someone you were LGB) earlier in comparison to lesbians and bisexuals (Pew Research Center 2013a). For example, the median age at which gay men first told someone they were gay was 18, while the median age for lesbian women was 21 (Lopez 2013). In addition, knowing someone who is lesbian or gay is associated with greater acceptance of homosexuality and support for same-sex marriage (Pew Research Center 2013b). Therefore, coming out is not only associated with personal outcomes, but can be associated with greater acceptance of the LGB population on the part of the broader population.

Despite previously established links to various mental and physical health outcomes, no known study has quantitatively examined how demographic and contextual factors are associated with coming out to parents. As Ryan et al. (2015) states, little is known about how sexual

orientation interacts with other identities (race, class, etc.) to influence coming out because they have not been the subject of systematic investigation (Consolacion, Russell, and Sue 2004). Furthermore, the majority of previous research on coming out has been qualitative, used clinical and convenience samples, and examined sexual minorities as a homogenous group (see Heatherington and Lavner 2008; Oswald 1999; Orne 2011; Scherrer et al. 2015). Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, I examine how demographic (bisexuality, race, and gender) and contextual (same-sex concentration, parental closeness, living with parents) factors are associated with the likelihood that sexual minorities have disclosed their sexual orientation identity to their parents.

Background

Defining coming out. According to Orne (2011), coming out has been conceptually inflated, a term that refers to "the expansion of an analytical concept to cover multiple definitions" (Orne 2011: 682). However, most often throughout the literature, coming out refers to disclosing a gay/lesbian/bisexual identity to others (e.g., Alpaslan et al. 2009; Dube and Savin-Williams 1999; Heathering and Lavner 2008; Legate et al. 2017; Oswald 1999; Waldner and Magrader 1999). Ryan et al. (2015) expand this definition and note that, "coming out is generally used to refer to the events surrounding one's initial disclosure of sexual orientation to one's primary social circle" (p. 552). Although the focus of some literature is on coming out as a one-time event (i.e., Ryan et al. 2015), previous literature is clear that coming out is a process (Denes and Afifi 2014; Orne 2011; Oswald 1999; Rust 1993; Scherrer, Kazyak, and Schmitz 2015). Sexual minority individuals must decide within every new situation and interaction whether or not to disclose their sexual orientation identity (Oswald 1999; Orne 2011; Legate et al. 2017).

Furthermore, coming out does not always take the form of direct, verbal disclosure (Ryan et al. 2015). Individuals can come out via writing, on social media, (Ryan et al. 2015) or indirectly through visual clues (Rudd 1996), gestures (Johnson, Gill, Reichman, and Tassinary 2007), and facial features (Rule et al. 2008; Rule et al. 2009) (cited in Ryan et al. 2015). Therefore, whether a parent knows about their child's homosexuality/bisexuality can be seen as a form of coming out whether or not the child directly discloses this information. Throughout this chapter I use the terms coming out and disclose/disclosure interchangeably to refer to an individual conveying their sexual orientation to others in some way.

Coming out to parents. According to Alpaslan and colleagues (2009), Chan (1989) and Green (1996), a child's decision to come out to a parent depends on a multitude of factors, including: levels of closeness, openness, conflict, amount of time together, salience of parents as a source of social, identity, and economic support, availability of other resources, and anticipated responses (Alpaslan et al. 2009: 27). More recent research by Bry, Mustanski, Garofalo, and Burns (2017) adds devaluation of societal acceptance, stress of hiding, desire for authenticity, sense of readiness, comfort with identity, perceived personal safety, trustworthiness of individual, perception identity is known to others, and others directly asking, to this list. Sexual minority individuals make decisions to disclose their sexual orientation identity through a negotiation of potential costs and benefits (Waldner and Magrader 1999). For example, LaSala (2000) interviewed twenty gay couples and found that although virtually all who had come out to their parents experienced initial and ongoing disapproval for their lifestyles and relationships, they believed it benefited themselves and their partner to be out to their parents. The respondents who were not out to their parents said they were afraid of upsetting them or feared rejection (LaSala 2000).

These fears are not unfounded. Alpaslan et al. (2009) and Maslowe and Yarhouse (2015) assessed parental reactions to children coming out. Alpaslan et al. (2009) found that parents expressed feelings of loss (and to lesser extent relief), responded with shock, feelings of disappointment, embarrassment, fear, guilt, and grieving. Similarly, Maslowe and Yarhouse (2015) found that Christian parents responded with grief/sorrow, anger, concern for child's safety, fear their child was abnormal, self-blame, crying, insomnia, as well as seeking support, information, and communicating disapproval. Although more children are coming out to their families more than ever before (Seidman 2002), negative reactions from parents are still a very real possibility.

Heatherington and Lavner (2008) conducted a review of studies of the individual, dyadic, and family level outcomes associated with coming out. They note that studies involving individual level variables have been the most common and highlight several consistent findings (Heatherington and Lavner 2008). Consistent with Pew Research Center (2013a) findings, fathers are told less often than mothers, and have worse reactions (Heathering and Lavner 2008). In addition, non-White individuals are less likely to be out to their parents, and individuals from very traditional or religious families are less likely to be out (see Heatherington and Lavner 2008 for review). Heatherington and Lavner (2008) also note that dyadic studies, where both sexual minority individuals and their parents/family members/colleagues participate, have been far less common (only eight known at the time of publication) but overall, the higher the relationship quality with parents, the more likely children are to be out to their parents. In addition, parents are not typically the first person that sexual minority individuals come out to; rather most individuals come out to a friend first (D'Augelli and Hershberger 1993; Maguen 2002; Rossi 2010; Ryan et al. 2015). For example, Ryan et al. (2015) found that only ten (out of 108) respondents came out to their mother first, and none came out to their father first.

As noted above, sexual minority individuals are more likely to come out to their mother, rather than their father (D'Augelli and Hershberger 1993; Maguen et al. 2002; Rossi 2010; Savin-Williams and Ream 2003) and if they come out to both parents, the mother is most often told first (Rossi 2010). Maguen and colleagues (2002) found that among sexual minority youth, over 80 percent were out to their mother and over 60 percent were out to their father. Qualitative work has also noted that the parent that a child comes out to may act as a gatekeeper in deciding when and how to tell other family members (Scherrer et al. 2015). Rossi (2010) concludes based on the findings that, "it is likely that characteristics of disclosure have not changed dramatically in the last 10-12 years" (p. 1185).

Waldner and Magruder (1999) examined how family relations, identity expression, and pro-lesbian/gay resources influenced coming out to parents among gay and lesbian adolescents. They found that less positive family relations were associated with lower levels of coming out to parents, but that this relationship was a function of both identity expression and gay-supportive resources (Waldner and Magrader 1999). Therefore, they conclude that having supportive resources and opportunities for identity expression can help overcome the effect of family on coming out (Waldner and Magrader 1999). As a result, Waldner and Magruder (1999) note that individuals living in rural areas would be less able to counter the effect of family because of a lack of other supportive resources. They are one of the first, and only, to mention the importance of context on coming out, a point I will return to later.

Differences in coming out: Bisexuality. As noted by Oswald (1999) and Scherrer et al. (2015) the majority of previous research on coming out has either not included bisexuals, or has

combined bisexuals with gay men and lesbian women because of small sample sizes. However, it is likely that coming out experiences are vastly different for bisexual individuals than it is for gay and lesbian individuals. Bisexuals are less likely to be out than gays and lesbians (Schrimshaw et al. 2013; Shilo and Savaya 2012; Weinberg, Williams, and Pryor 1994) and come out later (Rust 1993) than lesbian and gays. Pollitt et al. (2017) found that bisexual men, but not women, benefit from social support when they have stressful disclosure to friends that influences health.

Scherrer and colleagues (2015) conducted qualitative interviews with bisexual individuals and found several themes that are unique to bisexuals and coming out. First, bisexual individuals are aware of the negative cultural constructions of bisexuality (e.g., that it is transitory, associated with non-monogamy and promiscuity), and anticipated that their families would be too (Scherrer et al. 2015). These individuals took one of three approaches to coming out. First, they would not come out to their family at all, especially if they were exclusively in different-sex relationship or their families expressed negative attitudes toward homosexuality (Scherrer et al. 2015). Next, some bisexual respondents chose to come out as gay/lesbian, rather than bisexual because of their families "monosexist assumptions" about sexuality (Scherrer et al. 2015: Newman and Muzzonigro 1993). Third, some respondents came out as bisexual, or someone who may have a relationship with men or women (Scherrer et al. 2015).

Decisions to come out as bisexual were not only shaped by cultural construction of bisexuality but also by family reactions (Scherrer et al. 2015). For example, most family members viewed bisexuality as a "transitory" identity, which is a pathway to a more permanent identity (such as gay or lesbian) (Scherrer et al. 2015). Furthermore, experiencing of coming out as bisexual were gendered. Males' family members were more likely to think bisexual meant the respondent was 'really gay', while bisexual women were more likely to be accepted (Scherrer et al. al. 2015). As Scherrer and colleagues (2015) point out, "bisexual women's same-sex desire and relationships are more readily fetishized as ultimately serving the pleasure of heterosexual men" (p. 10). Given these findings, it is expected that bisexual respondents will be less likely to be out to their parents than gay/lesbian respondents.

Differences in coming out: Race. Small sample sizes and studies based largely on clinical and convenience samples have made it difficult to assess demographic differences in coming out. Newman and Muzzonigro (1993) noted that models of coming out had not adequately accounted for the influence of race or family values. Studies that do find significant racial differences note that white respondents, overall, are more likely to be out than non-whites respondents (see Heatherington and Lavner 2008 for review). In their sample of males, Dube and Savin-Williams (1999) found that white respondents had disproportionately high levels of disclosure, while Black and Asian respondents had disproportionately low levels of disclosure. Latino respondents displayed medium levels of disclosure (Dube and Savin-Williams 1999). In addition, white respondents were more likely to disclose to their mother, father, and siblings than any other racial group (Dube and Savin-Williams 1999). Similarly, Maguen et al. (2002) found whites were significantly more likely to be out to both parents than African Americans. Rosario, Schrimshaw, and Hunter (2004) found that black and Latino youth disclosed their identity to fewer people than whites. Dube and Savin-Williams (1999), Maguen et al. (2002) and Rosario et al. (2004) all utilized convenience samples of sexual minority youth. Giving these findings, it is expected that non-Hispanic white respondents will be more likely to be out to their parents than respondents of other race/ethnicities.

Differences in coming out: Age and gender. Previous research has understood disclosure as a later step in the model of coming out (Newman and Muzzonigro 1993; Waldner and

Magrader 1999), where individuals must first develop and become aware of a sexual minority identity before disclosing to individuals. Previous research has also examined the ages at which individuals first report awareness, same-sex attraction, same-sex sexual contact, labeling, and first disclosure (D'Augelli and Grossman 2001; D'Augelli and Hershberger 1993; Grov, Bimbi, Nanin, and Parsons 2006; Maguen et al. 2002; Savin-Wiilliams and Diamond 2000). Savin-Williams and Diamond (2000) found no significant gender differences at disclosure, but lesbian women reported later ages at first same-sex attraction, contact, and labeling. Grov and colleagues (2006) found no significant gender differences between ages that men and women reported coming out to others nor when they came out to their parents. However, younger cohorts of gay males were more likely to report being out to their parents than older cohorts (Grov et al. 2006). Small sample sizes made it impossible to examine differences for women (Grov et al. 2006). Dittrich (2005) also found no sex differences in age at telling a parent. D'Augelli and Grossman (2001) found that men were aware and self-labelled significantly earlier than women but there were no significant age differences in disclosure.

Maguen et al. (2002) examined different patterns of timing and sequences for sexual minority youth. Interestingly, no gay male youth reported becoming aware of their sexual orientation and disclosing their status to others at the same point in their life course (Maguen et al. 2002). However, this was the modal pattern for both lesbians and bisexuals. Instead, the modal order for both gay male and queer youth was same-sex contact first and then disclosing at a later age (Maguen et al. 2002). Women are known to have more fluid sexual orientations and identities than men (Diamond 2000). For example, Diamond (2000) notes that more than half of her sample reported multiple changes in their sexual identity and nearly one-quarter of women who identified as lesbians pursued sexual contact with men. She notes that while attraction

appears to remain stable, identity and behavior are fluid (Diamond 2000). Given the varying patterns in previous research it is unclear how age and gender are associated with coming out to parents. However, given earlier work which found that lesbians are rarely out to their families (Berg-Cross 1988) and that men report more affirming reactions from family (D'Augelli and Hershberger 1993), it is expected that males will be more likely to be out to their parents than females.

Context and coming out. Previous research on coming out has been largely psychological in nature and has "consistently considered the internal processes of individuals rather than social interactions of these members within their environments" (Orne 2011: 684). As noted by Orne (2011) there has been a "neglect of social context in coming out" throughout the literature and a "need for a perspective that emphasizes social context" (p. 682). Waldner and Magrader (1999) examined how perceived gay/lesbian social support networks were associated with coming out. Although not a direct measure of context, they note that youth living in rural areas are less able to counter the effects of family because of the lack of resources available to them (Waldner and Magrader 1999). Based on this finding we would expect individuals living in areas with higher concentration of same-sex couples, and urban areas, to be more likely to be out to their parents than those not living in those areas.

Legate, Ryan, and Weinstein (2012) use self-determination theory (SDT) framework to examine how the "autonomy supporting character of social contexts" is associated with outness. The SDT framework is concerned with how social contexts impact motivation and well-being (Legate et al. 2012). Contexts vary in their level of autonomy support, defined by Deci, La Guardia, Moller, Scheiner, and Ryan (2006) as the degree to which an individual experiences volition, choice, and personal endorsement in his or her behavior (Legate et al. 2012: 146). Participants were asked about the autonomy supportiveness (e.g., how much that a target provided them with choices or options) of different targets (e.g., friends, family, religious community). Legate et al. (2012) found that individuals were more likely to disclose in autonomy supportive contexts, regardless of gender, age, or sexual orientation. In other words, the more supportive the context, the more likely the individual was to be out to that person or target.

There has been research on regional differences in attitudes toward gay rights and exposure to gays/lesbians which could influence coming out (Bramlett 2010; Barth and Overby 2003; Skipworth, Garner, and Dettry 2010). Barth and Overby (2003) found that in the South, exposure to gays and lesbians does not increase tolerance for the group or enhance support for gay rights, like it does outside the South. More specifically Barth and Overby (2003) state, "While our findings suggest that this strategy [coming out so heterosexual will be more amenable to greater civil rights and protections for gay men and lesbians] may indeed be helpful in promoting civil rights protection in localities outside the region, in the South it may have disappointing results for the gay community" (p. 462). Additional previous research has found that contact with sexual minorities has weaker effects on Southerners (Bramlett 2010; Skipworth et al. 2010). These findings are consistent with Lipka (2014) who found that (prior to legalization of marriage to same-sex couples) individuals in the South were much less likely to support samesex marriage than those in other regions. For example, 44 percent of individuals in the South supported same-sex marriage, compared to 61 percent in the East, 58 percent in the West, and 52 percent in the Midwest (Lipka 2014). Taken together these results suggest that individuals living in the South may be less likely to come out to their parents than those living in other regions of the country.

Current Study

Previous research on this topic has been largely psychological (see Orne 2011), qualitative (Oswald 1999; Scherrer et al. 2015; Newman and Muzzonigro 119; Bry et al. 2017; Guittar 2011), using clinical and convenience samples (see Oswald 1999; Heatherington and Lavner 2008), and examining sexual minorities as a homogenous group (see Scherrer et al. 2015). The current study fills a gap in the literature and answers an important question by examining how demographic and social context are associated with the likelihood that sexual minorities have come out to parents. Drawing on data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, I will the following research questions: (1) How are demographic characteristics associated with coming out to parents? (2) How is social context associated with coming out to parents? I expect that bisexuals will be less likely to be out to parents than homosexuals. I expect that non-Hispanic whites will be more likely to be out to parents than females. I also expect that sexual minorities living in more supportive contexts will be more likely to be out to their parents than those living in less supportive contexts.

Data and Methods

Data for this research were obtained from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). Add Health is a nationally representative, school-based, longitudinal study of a 1994-1995 cohort of 7th -12th graders (Harris et al. 2009). Add Health used audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (ACASI) and partner rosters to identify all of the partners with whom respondents had ever experienced a "romantic or sexual relationship" that eventuated in pregnancy, cohabitation, or marriage, in addition to any other partners with whom they had a romantic or sexual relationships since 2001. Add Health subsequently asked respondents to provide the gender, age, and race/ethnicity of each partner. ACASI not only
maximizes privacy, but also allows for more complicated skip patterns (Paik 2015). Furthermore, Add Health contains multiple contextual databases, allowing for detailed and thorough examination of the influence of context. In-home interviews with the respondent were conducted in 1994-1995, 1996, 2001-2002, and 2007-2008. Overall, Add Health interviewed 20,745 adolescents at Wave I. At Wave III respondents were between 18 and 26 years old. Wave IV, the most recent wave of Add Health, was conducted in 2007-2008 when participants were between 24 and 32 years old.

Analytic sample. The sample of respondents was restricted in several ways. First, I drop respondents who are not sexual minorities; that is they did not identify was bisexual, mostly homosexual, or 100 percent homosexual at Wave III (n=14,725). Next, I exclude 31 individuals who were missing information on survey design variables. I also drop individuals who were missing on parental closeness (n=7) and religiosity (n=9). The final analytic sample consists of 425 respondents, including 163 men and 262 women. Specific sample sizes for each group can be found in the Appendix (see Appendix Table A2.1). Analyses of just homosexuals exclude the 220 individuals who identify as bisexual, for a final homosexual sample of 205 respondents, including 125 men and 80 women.

Dependent Variable

Out to parents. I use a measure of whether or not the respondent had disclosed their sexual orientation identity to either of their parents as an indicator of being out to parents. This measure was operationalized using the following question that immediately followed the Wave III measure of sexual orientation identity: "Which of your parents knows that you are bisexual/about your homosexuality? Neither parent knows, only mother knows, only father knows, both parents know." Responses were recoded as (0) neither parent knows and (1) only

mother knows, only father knows, or both parents know. This question was only asked of respondents who identified as bisexual, mostly homosexual, or 100% homosexual.

Independent Variables

Bisexuality. Bisexuality was operationalized using the following question from Wave III: "Please choose the description that best fits how you think about yourself: (1) 100% heterosexual (straight), (2) mostly heterosexual (straight), but somewhat attracted to people of your own sex, (3) bisexual that is, attracted to men and women equally, (4) mostly homosexual (gay), but somewhat attracted to people of the opposite sex, (5) 100% homosexual (gay), (6) not sexually attracted to either males or females." Responses were recoded as (0) for mostly/100% homosexuals and (1) for bisexual.

Race. Race of respondent was collected from the first wave of the study and was recoded as (1) non-Hispanic white and (0) all other race/ethnicities.

Gender. Gender was marked by the interviewer and will be coded as (0) for male and (1) for female.

Contextual Variables

Same-sex couple concentration. The percent of households headed by same-sex unmarried partners in respondent's tract was also used as an indicator of social support for sexual minorities. This measure was obtained from the contextual data appended to the Add Health by Swisher (2008). In supplemental analyses combining data from the U.S. Census and the 1988-2008 General Social Survey, Schwartz and Graf (2010) demonstrated that the percent of same-sex cohabiting couples across different locales was highly correlated with the percent of individuals identifying as gay or lesbian. Following prior work using the Add Health (Everett 2014), I use dummy variables in the models to distinguish different groups of respondents who identified as sexual minority according to the concentration of same-sex couples in their neighborhood. Preliminary analyses indicated that the same-sex couple concentration variable had large right skew and a modal value of zero. Thus, I divided sexual minorities into three equally-sized categories (or tertiles) on the basis of the concentration of same-sex cohabiting couples in their census tract. In supplemental analyses discussed later, I alternatively include a logged measure of same-sex couple concentration at the tract level.

Region. Region was measured at Wave I and includes four major Census regions of the United States (Midwest, Northeast, and West) with South acting as the reference group.

Family Variables

Living with two biological parents. Based on the household roster at Wave I, I establish if a respondent was living with both biological parents at Wave I.

Family SES. Family SES is based on a measure developed by Bearman and Moody (2004) that incorporates information on parental education and occupation from Wave I; this measure is widely used in studies based on Add Health.

Parental closeness. Respondents were asked as rate how close they felt to their biological mother, biological father, resident mother, resident father, resident step-mother, and resident step-father. Responses ranges from (1) not close at all to (5) extremely close. Parental closeness was indexed to the parent with whom the respondent reported feeling closest at Wave III.

Living with parents. At Wave III respondents were asked "Where do you live now? That is, where do you stay most often?" Responses were recoded as (0) another person's home, your own place, group quarters, homeless, other and (1) your parents' home.

Control Variables

Age at wave III. I include a variable for respondent's exact age at Wave III.

Geographic mobility. To operationalize geographic mobility I created two indicators based on whether grouping codes for respondents' tract and county are identical at Waves 1 and 3: moved to a different tract within the same county, moved to a different county, and being in the same tract at both Waves 1 and 3 (reference group).

Religiosity. Following previous work using Add Health (Rostosky, Danner, and Riggle 2010), a religiosity index was created based on the response to three items. The items will be "How often have you attended religious services in the past 12 months", "Many churches, synagogues, and other places of worship have special activities for young adults such as Bible classes, retreats, youth groups, and choir. In the past 12 months, how often have you taken part in such activities?"" and "How important is your religious faith to you?" For the first two questions responses range from (0) never to (3) once a week or more than once a week. For the last question responses range from (0) not important to (3) more important than anything else. The items were summed to create a religiosity index. The alpha of this index is .63. *Analytic Strategy*

The analysis begins by documenting differences among men and women in terms of coming out to parents, and the key demographic and contextual variables. With coming out to either parent operationalized as a binary outcome, logistic regression models were used to assess the extent to which demographic and contextual variables are associated with coming out to parents. First I examined the zero-order relationships between each of the variables and coming out to either parent. Next, Model 1 examined the relationship between the key demographic variables and being out to either parent. Model 2 examined the relationship between the contextual variables and being out to either parent. Model 3 examined the relationship between the family variables and being out to either parent. Model 4 examined the relationship between

all the control variables and being out to parents. Model 5 included all demographic, contextual, and family variables as well as the control variables. All analyses were run for the entire sexual minority sample and then broken down by gender. Finally, I run a parallel set of analyses are restricted to homosexuals (N=205).

Since Add-Health is a school-based sample, and the school areas do not correspond with the county boundaries, the hierarchical structure required for multi-level models is not present (Gordon-Larsen, Guilkey, and Popkin 2011). Also, because of the school-based nature of Add Health, counties contain few respondents on average, with vastly different numbers of respondents across counties and tracts (Gordon-Larsen et al. 2011). For example, at Wave I, almost half (43.2 percent) of all tracts included only a single respondent and the vast majority (93 percent) included fewer than 30 respondents. Sparseness is even greater when samples are limited to sexual minorities. For these reasons, I do not use multi-level models, but adjust for design effects.

Results

Descriptive results. Table 2.1 presents the weighted means and proportions first for the entire sample and then stratified by both gender and out to parents. I also test for statistical differences between out and not out groups (within genders). Overall, more than half the sample (57.3 percent) was out to at least one parent. Slightly more than half (51.1 percent) of the sample identified as bisexual rather than homosexual. Almost three quarters of the sample (73.7 percent) was non-Hispanic white and just over half of the sample (50.1 percent) did not live with both biological parents at Wave I. The average age of the sample is 21.7 and average religiosity score was 2.6, indicating that, overall, the sample is not very religious. The majority of the sample (65.6 percent) did not live with their parents at Wave III and the average parental closeness score

was 1.63, indicating respondents felt close to their parent. Almost half of the respondents (47.2 percent) moved to a different tract within the same county between Waves I and III, while 27.9 percent stayed in the same census tract and 24.8 percent moved to a different county.

There is remarkable similarity between men who were out to a parent and those who were not out to a parent. The only significant difference between the two groups was for identity (p<.05). Almost 90 percent (88.6 percent) of men who were out identified as homosexual, compared to 56.5 percent of men who were not out. Similarly, only 11.3 percent of men who were out identified as bisexual, compared to 43.5 percent of men who were not out. Otherwise, the samples of out and not out men were not significantly different from each other on any other indicator.

As with men, there is also remarkably similarity between women who were out to a parent and those who were not out to a parent. Once again, the only significant difference between the two groups was for identity. Approximately 90 percent of women who were not out identified as bisexual, compared to 51.2 percent of women who were out. Similarly, less than 10 percent (9.98 percent) of women who were out identified as homosexual, compared to 48.8 percent of women who were not out. The samples of out and not out women were not significantly different from each other on any other indicator.

Multivariate results. Table 2.2 presents odds ratios from logistic regressions predicting out to either parent for the entire sample. Column 1 displays the zero-order relationship between each of the independent, contextual, and control variables. Bisexuals have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than homosexuals. Individuals living in a tract with a medium concentration of same-sex couples had marginally significant higher (p<.10) odds of being out to either parent than those who lived in a tract with a low concentration of same-sex couples;

however, those living in a tract with a high concentration of same-sex couples did not differ from those living in a tract with a low concentration of same-sex couples. Age was also positively associated with coming out. Finally, individuals who were closer to their parents had marginally significant higher odds of being out to either parent.

Model 1 displays the odds after adding bisexual, female, and white to the model. After adding sex and race to the model, bisexuals still have significantly lower odds of being out to ether parent than homosexuals. Females have marginally significantly higher odds of being out to either parent than males (p<.10) and whites have marginally higher odds of being out to either parent than individuals of other races (p<.10). Model 2 includes the contextual variables of proportion of same-sex couples in the tract and region. Individuals living in tracts with medium and high concentrations of same-sex couples have significantly higher odds of being out to either parent than individuals living in tracts with low concentration of same-sex couples. Region is not significantly associated with being out to either parent. Model 3 includes the family variables. Parental closeness is significantly associated with being out to either parent (p<.10). Individuals who were closer to their parents have higher odds of being out than those who are less close to their parents. Model 4 includes all the control variables in the model. When including all of the control variables together, only age is significantly associated with coming out.

Model 5 displays the full model. Even after adding all the variables, bisexuals have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than homosexuals, as hypothesized. Females have marginally significant higher odds of being out to either parent than males. This does not support the hypothesis that men would be more likely to be out to their parents than women. White individuals have marginally significant higher odds of being out to either parent than individuals of other races. This supports the hypothesis that non-Hispanic white individuals who be more likely to be out to either parent than individuals of other race/ethnicities. Individuals living in tracts with medium or high concentrations of same-sex couples have significantly higher odds of being out to either parent than those living in tracts with low concentrations of same-sex couples. This supports the hypothesis that individuals living in more supportive contexts would be more likely to be out than those living in less supportive contexts. Finally, individuals living in the Midwest had higher odds of being out than those living in the South. However, individuals living in the South and Northeast did not have significantly different odds of being out than those living in the South

Table 2.3 displays odds ratios from logistic regression models predicting being out to either parent stratified for sexual minority men. Columns 1 and 7 show the zero-order models for men and women, respectively. At the zero-order level bisexual men have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than homosexual men. Parental closeness and religiosity are also both have marginally significant relationships with being out to either parent for men. Men who were closer to their parents had higher odds of being out than those who were not. Men who were more religious had higher odds of being out to either parent than those who were less religious. In analyses not shown, the relationship between religiosity and being out to either parent falls out of significance when the bisexual indicator is included in the model.

Model 1 includes the bisexual and white indicators. Even after adding race to the model, bisexual men have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than homosexuals. Race is not significantly associated with being out for men. Model 2 includes just the contextual variables. When just including contextual variables in the model, none are significantly associated with being out to either parent for men. Model 3 includes the family variables. Only parental closeness is significantly associated with being out to either parent for men. Men who were closer to their parents had higher odds of being out than those who were not. Model 4 includes all the control variables. Among the control variables, only religiosity is significantly associated with being out for men. Men who were more religious had higher odds of being out to either parent than those who were less religious.

Model 5 represents the full model. Bisexual men have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than homosexual men. This supports the hypothesis that bisexuals would be less likely to be out to either parent than homosexuals. Men living in tracts with medium concentration of same-sex couple were three times more likely to be out to either parent than those who were living in a tract with low concentration of same-sex couples; however, men living in tracts with high concentration of same-sex couples do not have significantly different odds of being out than those living in a tract with a low concentration of same-sex couples. Adding race and sexuality to the model makes concentration significant. Finally, white men were two times more likely to be out, as expected, and religiosity was no longer important.

Table 2.4 displays odds ratios from logistic regression models predicting being out to either parent stratified for sexual minority women. At the zero-order level, bisexual women have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than homosexual women. Geographic mobility was also associated with being out for women. Women who moved to a different tract within the same county, and those who moved to a different county, have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than women who stayed in the same census tract. Model 1 includes the sexual identity and race variables. Bisexual women are significantly less likely to be out to either parent than homosexual women. Model 2 includes the contextual variables. Women living in a tract with a high concentration of same-sex couples have significantly higher odds of being out to either parent than those living in a tract with a low concentration of same-sex couples. However, women in tracts with medium concentration of same-sex couples do not have significantly different odds of being out to either parents than women in tracts with low concentrations of same-sex couples. Model 3 includes the family variables. When including just the family variables in the model, none are significantly associated with coming out to either parent for women. Model 4 includes all the control variables. Once again, women who moved to a different tract within the same county, and those who moved to a different county, have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than women who stayed in the same census tract. Model 5 represents the full model. After including all the variables, bisexual women have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than homosexuals, as hypothesized. Contrary to expectations, race is not significantly associated with being out to either parent for women. Women living in tracts with medium concentration of same-sex couples have higher odds of being out to either parent than those who live in tracts with low concentration of samesex couples; however, sexual minority women in tracts with high concentration of same-sex couples do not have significantly different odds of being out than sexual minority women living in tracts with low concentration of same-sex couples. Adding race and sexuality to the model makes concentration significant (not shown). Again, women who moved between Waves I and III had significantly lower odds of being out to their parents than those who stayed in the same census tract. Finally, women who lived in the Midwest had significantly higher odds of being out than those who lived in the South. However, sexual minority women living in the West and Northeast did not have significantly different odds of being out than sexual minority women living in the South.

Table 2.5 displays the odds ratios from logistic regression models predicting being out to either parents for just homosexual respondents. The first column represents the zero-order

relationships between each of the variables and coming out. Among homosexual respondents, women were two times as likely to be out than men. In addition, those living in the Midwest were three times as likely to be out than those in the South. Model 1 includes race and gender. After including race in the model, gender is still significantly associated with coming out. Homosexual women have significantly higher odds of being out to either parent than homosexual men. Model 2 includes the contextual variables. Homosexual individuals living in the Midwest have significantly higher odds of being out to either parent than homosexual individuals living in the South. However, homosexual individuals living in the West and Northeast do not have significantly different odds of being out to either parent than homosexual individuals living in the South. Model 3 includes the family variables. When just the family variables are included in the model, none are significantly associated with being out to either parent among homosexual individuals.

Model 5 represents the full model. Homosexuals living in a tract with high concentration of same-sex couples were three times more likely to be out to either parent than those living in a tract with a low concentration of same-sex couples. Homosexuals living in tracts with medium concentration of same-sex couples did not have significantly different odds of being out to parents than those living in tracts with low concentration of same-sex couples. Finally, homosexual respondents living in the Midwest were three times more likely to be out than those living in the South. Homosexual respondents living in the West and Northeast did not have significantly different odds of being out than those living in the South. Table 2.6 presents the odds ratios from logistic regression models predicting being out to either parents for just homosexual men. At the zero-order level, only parental closeness and religiosity were associated with being out to either parent for homosexual men. Homosexual men who were closer to their parent had higher odds of being out to either parent. Homosexual men who were more religious had higher odds of being out to either parent. When just the contextual variables are included in the model (Model 1), none are significantly associated with being out to either parent for homosexual men. Model 2 includes just the family variables. When only family variables are in the model, only parental closeness is marginally significantly associated with being out to either parent for homosexual men (p<.10). Homosexual men who are closer to their parents have significantly higher odds of being out to either parent than homosexual men who are not. When all the control variables are included (Model 3), nothing is significantly associated with being out to either parent for homosexual men.

After adding all variables to the model (Model 4), homosexual men living in tracts with a medium concentration of same-sex couples have marginally significant higher odds of being out to either parent than homosexual men living in tracts with low concentration of same-sex couples. However, individuals living in tracts with high concentration of same-sex couples do not have significantly different odds of being out than those in tracts with low concentration of same-sex couples. Concentration of same-sex couples becomes significant when race is added to the model (not shown). Homosexual white men have marginally significant higher odds of being out to either parent than homosexual men of other races and ethnicities.

Table 2.7 presents the odds ratios from logistic regression models predicting being out to either parents for just homosexual men. For homosexual women, at the zero-order level, only region is significantly associated with being out to either parent. More specifically, homosexual women living in the Midwest had 11 times the odds of being out to either parent than homosexual women living in the South. However, homosexual women living in the West and Northeast did not have significantly different odds of being out to either parent than homosexual women living in the South. Model 1 includes the contextual variables. Once again, only region is significantly associated with being out to either parent. Homosexual women living in the Midwest had 10 times the odds of being out to either parent than homosexual women living in the South. However, homosexual women living in the West and Northeast did not have significantly different odds of being out to either parent than homosexual women living in the South. However, homosexual women living in the West and Northeast did not have significantly different odds of being out to either parent than homosexual women living in the South. When including just the family variables in the model (Model 2) or when only the control variables are included in the model (Model 3), nothing was significantly associated with being out to either parent for homosexual women.

Model 4 represents the full model. After including all the variables, homosexual women living in the Midwest and Northeast had significantly higher odds of being out to either parent, than homosexual women living in the South. Homosexual women living in the West did not have significantly different odds of being out than homosexual women living in the South. Finally, homosexual women living with two biological parents at Wave I had marginally significant lower odds of being out to either parent than those who were not living with two biological parents at Wave I.

Supplemental analyses. I also conducted several analyses that are not displayed in this chapter. First, I examined how same-sex corsidence was associated with coming out at Wave III (see Appendix Table A2.2. and Table A4.32.). At Wave III, 7.4 percent of sexual minority men (n=12) and 8.4 percent of sexual minority women (n=22) were in a same-sex coresidential relationship. Among individuals in a same-sex coresidential relationship at Wave III, 90.9

percent of sexual minority women (n=20) and 75 percent of sexual minority men (n=9) were out to either parent. Examining coresidence is important because a shared home entails visibility and openness for same-sex couples (Fischer et al. 2016).

At the zero-order level, individuals living with a same-sex partner had over 11 times the odds (OR=11.591; p=.000) of being out to either parent. Once adding all variables to the model, individuals in a same-sex coresidential still had over 9 times the odds (OR= 9.711; p = .000) of being out to either parent than those who were not living with a same-sex partner. A similar pattern is seen when examining men and women separately. At both the zero-order (OR=5.601; p=.049) and in the full model (OR=9.893; p=.013), men who are living with a same-sex partner are significantly more likely to be out to either parent. Similarly, at the zero-order (OR=24.421; p=.000) and in the full model (OR=11.130; p=.011), women who are living with a same-sex partner are significantly more likely to be out to either parent.

In addition, I ran models that included measures of Region at Wave III, instead of Wave I. The results (not shown) were nearly identical to those presented here. Next, I ran models that included just a dummy for living in the South at Wave I. The South dummy was not significantly associated with being out to either parent for the entire sample, sexual minority men or sexual minority women at the zero-order level or when included in the full models. However, the South dummy was significantly negatively associated with being out to either parent for the entire out to either parent for the entire and the entire parent for the entire being out to either parent or the entire homosexual sample as well as homosexual women. I also ran models that included a measure of moving more than 50 miles between Wave I and III (rather than the geographic mobility variables). Moving more than 50 miles between Wave I and III was not significantly associated with being out for the entire sample, sexual minority men, sexual minority women, the homosexual sample, homosexual men, or homosexual women.

In addition, I ran models that included various specifications of the Republican voting variable. More specifically, I examined the linear specification of voting for the Republican presidential candidate in the 2000 election as well as breaking the variable into low, medium, and high concentration categories. I also examined voting for the Republican candidate (Bush) in the 2004 election, as well as voting for the Republican Senatorial and governor candidate (rather than the Presidential candidate) in the 2000 election. Furthermore, I examined voting at different thresholds (for example counties with more than 70 percent voting for the Republican candidate), for men and women combined as well as separately, and for the entire sexual minority sample as well as just homosexuals. Republican voting was never significantly associated with coming out.

Finally, I examined the association between other parent and family variables, such as providing money ("Has your mother given you any money or paid for anything significant for you during the past 12 months?"), parent religiosity, and having siblings. Providing money, parent religiosity, parent religious affiliation, and having siblings were all not significantly related to coming out for any of the samples at the zero-order level or in the full model. Small sample sizes prevented me from examining differences in coming out to just mother or father. *Discussion*

Coming out remains one of the most stressful process faced by sexual minorities (Hershberger, Pilkington, and D'Augelli 1997; Maslowe and Yarhouse 2015; Maugen et al. 2002; Rotheram-Borus et al. 1995; Scherrer et al. 2015). While several studies have examined how coming out is tied to both positive and negative outcomes, few have examined the correlates of coming out. Previous research on coming out has been largely psychological (see Orne 2011), qualitative (Oswald 1999; Scherrer et al. 2015; Newman and Muzzonigro 119; Bry et al. 2017; Guittar 2011), used clinical and convenience samples (see Oswald 1999; Heatherington and Lavner 2008), examined sexual minorities as a homogenous group (see Scherrer et al. 2015), and did not consider context (for notable exception see Waldner and Magrader 1999). This study serves as one of the first and only examinations of coming out that emphasizes social context using a nationally representative cohort. The current study used data from Wave III of Add Health to examine how demographic, contextual, and family indicators were associated with likelihood of being out to either parent among sexual minorities.

As expected, coming out to either parent differs by sexual orientation identity. As hypothesized, bisexual respondents had significantly lower odds of being out to either parent than homosexual respondents. This finding held for the sample overall, as well as when examining men and women separately. This is consistent with previous research (Schrimshaw et al. 2013; Shilo and Savaya 2012; Weinberg, Williams, and Pryor 1994) which suggests that bisexuals are less likely to come out than homosexuals and come out later (Rust 1993). Bisexuals are aware of the negative cultural connotations surrounding bisexuality (e.g., that it is transitory, associated with non-monogamy and promiscuity) that do not exist (at least not in the same way) for homosexuality, and therefore as less likely to come out to their parents (Scherrer et al. 2015).

Among the whole sample, women and non-Hispanic whites has marginally significant higher odds of being out to either parent than men and individuals of other race/ethnicities. These findings are not consistent with previous research (Berg-Cross 1988) which found that lesbians are rarely out to their families and do not support the hypothesis that men will be more likely to be out to either parent than women. In addition, these findings are consistent with previous research (Dube and Savin-Williams 1999; Maguen et al. 2002; Rosario et al. 2004) which found that whites had higher levels of disclosure than other racial/ethnic groups and provide partial

support the hypothesis that hypothesis that non-Hispanic whites would be more likely to be out to either parent than respondents of other race/ethnicities.

Consistent with the minority stress hypothesis (Meyer 1995; Meyer 2003), men and women living in areas with higher concentrations of same-sex couples were more likely to be out to either parent than those living in areas with low concentrations of same-sex couples. More specifically, sexual minorities living in areas with medium or high concentrations of same-sex couples were roughly two time more likely to be out to either parent than those living in a tract with a low concentration of same-sex couples.

Importantly, parental context does not appear to matter for coming out to parents. Neither living with parents at Wave III, living with both biological parents at Wave I, nor parental closeness, were significantly associated with coming out to either parent for the entire sample. Previous research suggested that deciding to come out to parents is based on a multitude of factors such as parental closeness and economic resources (Alpaslan et al. 2009; Chan 1989; Green 1996). However, this does not appear to be the case for this nationally representative sample.

When examining coming out separately for men and women, those living in a tract with a medium concentration of same-sex couples have higher odds of being out to either parent than those who live in a tract with a low concentration of same-sex couples. Once again, this supports the hypothesis that individuals living in more supportive environments will be more likely to come out than those who are not. Interestingly, geographic mobility appears to matter for sexual minority women, but not men, whereas race appears to matter for sexual minority men but not women. Sexual minority women who moved between Waves I and III had marginally significant lower odds of being out to either parent than sexual minority women who stayed in the same

census tract. This is consistent with previous research by Rosenfeld and Kim (2005) who argue that residential and geographic independence of young adults has made it easier for sexual minorities to from same-sex unions. Sexual minority men who are white were two times more likely to be out to either parent than those who were not white. This is consistent with previous research by Dube and Savin-Williams (1999) that found that among a sample of males, whites had disproportionately higher levels of disclosure than other racial and ethnic groups.

Among just homosexuals, only concentration of same-sex couples in the tract and region of the country matter for coming out. More specifically, homosexuals living in tracts with high concentrations of same-sex couples were three times more likely to be out to either parent than those living in tracts with low concentration of same-sex couples. Once again, this is consistent with the minority stress hypothesis and supports the hypothesis that individuals who live in more supportive contexts will be more likely to come out than those who live in less supportive contexts. Interestingly, homosexuals who live in the Midwest were three times the odds of being out than those who lived in the South. This is consistent with previous research (Lipka 2014) which found that individuals in the South are less supportive of gay rights and that contact with sexual minorities has weaker effects on Southerners (Barth and Overby 2003; Bramlett 2010; Skipworth et al. 2010). These findings show that the coming out process may be different for homosexuals than bisexuals.

It appears that the broader social context (concentration of same-sex couples) has a stronger influence on coming out than the more immediate social context (family/parental characteristics). This is surprising given previous research (Alpaslan et al. 2009; Bry et al. 2017; Chan 1989; Green 1996; LaSala 2000) which has noted that children make decisions about to come out to their parents based largely on parental characteristics. The findings of this study are encouraging as they suggest the larger social context can overcome the parental environments that keep individuals from coming out.

There are several limitations to the current study. First, only individuals who identified as bisexual, mostly homosexual, or 100 percent homosexual were asked the question about being out to either of their parents. Therefore, there is a possible selection issue of individuals who are more comfortable with their sexuality self-identifying as bisexual or homosexual and therefore being asked the parental knowledge of sexuality question. Next, the question used to operationalized coming out asks respondents which of their parents "knows about their bisexuality/homosexuality." While parental knowledge of a child's sexuality can be counted as coming out (Ryan et al. 2015), it is possible that respondents indicated their parent knew about their sexuality but they may have never directly disclosed the information (or "come out"). It is impossible, based on Add Health data, to disaggregate the difference between these. Other surveys, for example, include more direct questions such as "How old were you when you first told a close friend or family member that you were LGBT?" (Pew Research Center 2013a), "At what age did you disclose your sexual identity to each of the following individuals?" (Dube and Savin-Williams 1999), "How old were you when you told another person you were GLB?" (Grov et al. 2006), and "Are you parents (or person/s who raised you) aware of your sexual activity with same-gendered partners?" (Grov et al. 2006).

Next, respondents were asked limited questions about the relationship with their parents. While Add Health asked questions about parental closeness, living with parents, and parents providing financial support, other variables such as trust or political views of parents were not included. It is possible that sexual minorities may have a close relationship with their parents, but do not trust them, and therefore do not come out. Alternatively, sexual minorities could have a close relationship with their parents but know their parents are very religious or conservative and therefore, do not come out. Future research should focus more on relationship dynamics between parents and children and how this relates to coming out.

In addition, the question about disclosing sexual orientation identity was limited to parents. Previous research has shown that sexual minorities typically come out to a friend before coming out to a parent (D'Augelli and Hershberger 1993; Maguen 2002; Rossi 2010; Ryan et al. 2015). Contextual, demographic, and family factors may have a unique influence on coming out to friends that is different than coming out to parents. Future research should explore these avenues. Furthermore, although Add Health contains more sexual minorities than other large datasets (for example the 2016 Wave of the General Social Survey only has 102 individuals who identify as homosexual or bisexual), the sample sizes, especially of just homosexuals, are still small for quantitative analysis.

Finally, supplemental analyses revealed a strong association between same-sex coresidence and being out to either parent. It is unclear what the causal order is between coming out and forming a same-sex coresidential union for this sample. For many, forming a same-sex coresidential union may constitute a key element of the coming out process. Therefore, coming out to parents could predict subsequent union formation. Union formation will be explored in Chapter III.

Overall, bisexuals are less likely to be out to either parent than their homosexual counterparts, and sexual minorities living in areas with higher concentrations of same-sex couples are more likely to be out than those who are not. Parental and family characteristics do not appear to influence coming out to parents among sexual minorities generally, or homosexuals specifically. The current study takes an important step in examining how structural and

demographic factors are (or are not) associated with coming out to parents among a nationally representative cohort of young adults. Future research should extend this line of scholarship by examining how coming out to parents differs from coming out to friends or in the workplace.

L			Not Out	Out	Not Out	
	Full	Out Men	Men	Women	Women	
Variables	Sample	(n=96)	(n=67)	(n=137)	(n=125)	
	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	
Coming Out						
Not out to either parent	42.67	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	
Out to either parent	57.33	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	
Sexual Orientation Identity (W3)						
Bisexual	51.08	11.39	** 43.51	51.18 ***	90.02	
Mostly/100% homosexual	48.92	88.61	** 56.49	48.82 ***	9.98	
Race/Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic white	73.65	69.25	62.57	80.43	75.45	
Other	26.35	30.75	37.43	19.57	24.55	
Gender						
Male	39.33	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	
Female	60.67	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	
Context Variables						
Concentration same-sex households (tract)						
Low	36.66	36.18	48.76	27.34	41.64	
Medium	34.37	34.10	23.48	47.56	33.07	
High	28.98	29.72	27.76	18.99	25.29	
Region (W1)						
West	18.47	15.74	21.28	14.36	24.27	
Midwest	32.88	31.50	20.82	39.85	32.35	
Northeast	13.77	17.22	10.68	15.29	10.61	
South (ref)	34.88	35.55	47.22	30.50	32.76	
Family Variables						
Living with Two Biological Parents (W1)						
No	50.11	48.43	49.71	56.35	44.29	
Yes	49.89	51.57	50.29	43.65	55.71	
Family SES (W1)	5.367	5.513	5.574	5.527	4.931	
Parental closeness (W3)	1.630	1.383	1.667	1.704	1.739	
Living with Parent (W3)						
No	65.55	64.65	65.02	65.36	66.87	
Yes	34.45	35.35	34.98	34.64	33.13	
Control Variables						
Age (W3)	21.700	22,116	21,557	21.784	21.311	
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)						
Same census tract	27.93	26.75	32.33	33.45	19.91	
Moved to different tract within county	47.22	39.64	41.59	47.56	56.59	
Moved to different county	24.84	33.61	26.09	18.99	23.50	
Religiosity	2.601	3.067	2.356	2.471	2.483	

TADIE 2.1. Describute Statistics for Out to Either Parent (N^{-2})	able 2.1. De	criptive Statist	ics for Out to	Either Parent	(N=42)
---	--------------	------------------	----------------	---------------	--------

Notes: Two-tailed test of sigificance between out and not out groups. $\ddagger p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001$

	Zero Orde	r	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	-	Model 5	;
Demographics												
Bisexual (ref = Homosexual)	0.189	***	0.123	***							0.094	***
Female	0.755		1.920	ţ							1.928	†
White	1.281		1.825	ţ							2.046	†
Contextual Variables												
Proportion Same-Sex Couples (Tract)												
Low Concentration (ref)												
Medium Concentration	1.815	†			1.897	*					2.949	**
High Concentration	1.688				1.794	ţ					2.419	*
Region (W1)												
South (ref)												
West	0.748				0.637						0.934	
Midwest	1.493				1.451						2.218	*
Northeast	1.758				1.513						2.130	
Family Variables												
Living with Two Biological Parents (W1)	0.762						0.725				0.602	
Family SES (W1)	1.056						1.060				1.031	
Live with Parents (W3)	1.052						1.099				1.223	
Parental Closeness (W3)	0.804	†					0.801	Ť			0.898	
Controls												
Age at Wave III	1.182	*							1.173	*	1.031	
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)												
Same census tract (ref)												
Moved to different tract within county	0.685								0.671		0.603	
Moved to different county	0.818								0.825		0.631	
Religiosity	1.098								1.084		1.130	

Notes: Survey-adjusted models. † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

			Men	(n=163)		
	Zero Order	Model 1 N	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Demographic Variables						
Bisexual (ref = Homosexual)	0.167 **	0.150 **				0.106 **
White	1.347	1.790				2.725 †
Contextual Vairables						
Proportion Same-Sex Couples (Tract)						
Low Concentration (ref)						
Medium Concentration	1.957		2.108			3.104 *
High Concentration	1.443		1.573			2.024
Region (W1)						
South (ref)						
West	0.982		0.749			0.985
Midwest	2.010		1.959			2.623
Northeast	2.142		1.743			2.309
Family Variables						
Living with Two Biological Parents (W3)	1.053			1.095		0.711
Family SES (W1)	0.992			0.986		0.959
Live with Parents (W3)	1.016			0.928		0.841
Parental Closeness (W3)	0.548 †			0.544	†	0.69
Controls						
Age at Wave III	1.177				1.198	1.073
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)						
Same census tract (ref)						
Moved to different tract within county	1.152				0.985	0.881
Moved to different county	1.556				1.661	1.308
Religiosity	1.236 †				1.253	* 1.249

Table 2.2 Odds Dation from Lagistic Da arian Madala af Out to Eithar Da ont Ma

Notes: Survey-adjusted models.

† p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

				Wome	Women (n=262)				
	Zero Orde	er	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5		
Demographic Variables									
Bisexual (ref = Homosexual)	0.116	***	0.107	***			0.086 ***		
White	1.337		1.843				1.904		
Contextual Vairables									
Proportion Same-Sex Couples (Tract)									
Low Concentration (ref)									
Medium Concentration	1.871			1.907			2.319 †		
High Concentration	1.930			2.053	†		1.912		
Region (W1)									
South (ref)									
West	0.635			0.561			0.942		
Midwest	1.323			1.286			2.163 †		
Northeast	1.547			1.311			2.084		
Family Variables									
Living with Two Biological Parents (W3)	0.616				0.576		0.564		
Family SES (W1)	1.101				1.112		1.082		
Live with Parents (W3)	1.070				1.153		1.482		
Parental Closeness (W3)	0.956				0.937		0.999		
Controls									
Age at Wave III	1.175	ţ				1.178 †	1.077		
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)									
Same census tract (ref)									
Moved to different tract within county	0.500	ţ				0.505 †	0.450 †		
Moved to different county	0.481	Ť				0.494 †	0.370 †		
Religiosity	0.996					0.973	1.043		

Table 2.4 Odds Paties from Lagistic Pa maggion Models of Out to Fither Perent: We

Notes: Survey-adjusted models.

† p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Table 2.5. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent: Homosexuals (N=205)										
	Zero Order		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	
Demographic Variables										
Female	2.354 *	:	2.258	*					1.977	
White	1.734		1.687						2.454	
Contextual Variables										
Proportion Same-Sex Couples (Tract)										
Low Concentration (ref)										
Medium Concentration	2.141				1.861				2.760	
High Concentration	2.063				1.875				3.326	Ť
Region (W1)										
South (ref)										
West	2.165				1.703				2.412	
Midwest	3.195 *	:			3.121	*			3.810	*
Northeast	3.527				2.902				3.513	
Family Variables										
Living with Two Biological Parents (W3)	0.606						0.601		0.472	
Family SES (W1)	1.015						1.014		0.966	
Live with Parents (W3)	1.122						1.263		1.136	
Parental Closeness (W3)	0.776						0.791		0.798	
Controls										
Age at Wave III	1.048							1.032	1.000	
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)										
Same census tract (ref)										
Moved to different tract within county	0.767							0.774	0.636	
Moved to different county	0.578							0.588	0.359	
Religiosity	0.990							0.984	1.039	

Notes: Survey Adjusted Models † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Table 2.6. Odds Ratios from Logistic Reg	Regression Wodels of Out to Either Parent: Homosexual Wen								
			Men (n=12:	5)					
	Zero Order	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4				
Demographic Variables									
White	1.739				3.033 †				
Contextual Variables									
Proportion Same-Sex Couples (Tract)									
Low Concentration (ref)									
Medium Concentration	2.165	1.870			3.627 †				
High Concentration	2.115	1.982			2.409				
Region (W1)									
South (ref)									
West	2.027	1.443			1.783				
Midwest	2.274	2.227			2.337				
Northeast	3.138	2.528			2.176				
Family Variables									
Living with Two Biological Parents (W3	0.647		0.732		0.599				
Family SES (W1)	1.003		1.009		0.973				
Live with Parents (W3)	1.050		0.984		0.933				
Parental Closeness (W3)	0.454 *		0.464 †		0.560				
Controls									
Age at Wave III	1.044			1.044	1.053				
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)									
Same census tract (ref)									
Moved to different tract within coun	t 0.918			0.831	0.755				
Moved to different county	0.801			0.835	0.549				
Religiosity	1.108 †			1.116	1.108				

Table 26 Odda Dation from Lariatia Da aion Madala of Out to Ethon De 11/1 ti II.

Notes: Survey-adjusted models.

† p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

		W	omen (n=80)		
	Zero Order	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Demographic Variables					
White	1.550				0.699
Contextual Variables					
Proportion Same-Sex Couples (Tract)					
Low Concentration (ref)					
Medium Concentration	1.607	1.310			1.156
High Concentration	1.750	1.452			1.647
Region (W1)					
South (ref)					
West	2.997	2.864			5.884
Midwest	11.032 *	10.897 *			30.643 *
Northeast	7.379	6.655			13.556 †
Family Variables					
Living with Two Biological Parents (W3)	0.602		0.557		0.167 †
Family SES (W1)	1.097		1.099		1.016
Live with Parents (W3)	1.726		1.690		1.130
Parental Closeness (W3)	1.589		1.469		1.921
Controls					
Age at Wave III	1.147			1.141	1.202
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)					
Same census tract (ref)					
Moved to different tract within county	0.456			0.429	0.159
Moved to different county	0.299			0.306	0.044
Religiosity	0.731			0.698	0.709

Table 2.7. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent: Homosexuals Women

Notes: Survey-adjusted models.

† p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

CHAPTER III. SEXUAL MINORITIES, SOCIAL CONTEXT, AND UNION FORMATION

Sexual minorities, and same-sex couples in particular, encounter specific challenges associated with their identity, such as discrimination, lack of formal relationship recognition and benefits, and potential alienation from family and friends (Goldberg and Sayer 2006); however, this is changing. The social context surrounding relationship recognition for sexual minorities has changed rapidly over the past two decades. Prior to 1997, no state in the United States legally recognized same-sex unions (Human Rights Campaign 2017). In 2000, Vermont became the first state to recognize same-sex civil unions and in 2003 Massachusetts became the first state to legalize same-sex marriage (Human Rights Campaign 2017). Ten years after legalization of same-sex marriage in Massachusetts, less than 40 percent of the United States population lived in a state that recognized same-sex marriage (Human Rights Campaign 2013). Two years later, on June 26, 2015, the United States Supreme Court ruled on *Obergefell v. Hodges*, effectively allowing same-sex marriage in all states.

The rapid social change surrounding relationship recognition may signal a reduction in the discrimination of sexual minorities that could potentially improve their physical and mental health (King and Bartlett 2006). Suggestive of this, Hatzenbuehler and colleagues found that LGB adults living in states with hate crime and employment discrimination protection had lower rates of psychiatric disorders than LGB adults living in states with no protections (Hatzenbuehler, Keyes, and Hasin 2009). Similarly, using longitudinal data, Hatzenbuehler and colleagues found that increases in psychiatric morbidity between interviews were greater for sexual minorities who resided in states that passed bans on same-sex marriage than for their counterparts whose states did not pass bans (Hatzenbuehler, McLaughlin, Keyes, and Hassin 2010). Presumably, the legal recognition of same-sex relationships could also have implications for the formation and dynamics of coresidential unions for sexual minorities.

Our understanding of same-sex union transitions is based on research examining relationship dissolution. For example, fewer than twenty studies had examined the stability of same-sex couples as of 2017 (Joyner, Manning, and Bogle 2017). And while researchers continue to document the size and composition of same-sex coresidential unions (i.e., Frisch and Hviid 2006; Herek et al. 2010; Rosenfeld 2007), they have not fully identified factors that promote or impede the formation of these unions (Bennett 2017; Strohm 2010). To my knowledge, researchers have not examined how sexual orientation is associated with the timing to a first same-sex coresidential union in the United States, and none has examined how indicators of social context are associated with same-sex union formation. Given the importance of unions for supporting the health and well-being of sexual minorities (Umberson and Kroeger 2015), it is critical to assess the entry into unions. Data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) provide the unusual opportunity to address this issue in the United States. Drawing on the minority stress framework, I use data from Add Health to examine how sexual orientation identity is associated with the likelihood of forming a same-sex coresidential union. Limiting the sample to sexual minorities, I then examine how social context indicators are associated with the hazard rate of forming a first same-sex union specifically. Background

Union formation in young adulthood. Patterns of union formation have shifted dramatically over the past few decades. The median age at first marriage has reached an all-time high (U.S. Census Bureau 2017). There has also been a dramatic increase in cohabitation (Bumpass and Lu 2000; Manning, Brown, and Payne 2014; Lamidi and Manning 2016). According to Lamidi and Manning (2016), cohabitation becoming the most common relationship experience in young adulthood. While the age at first marriage has increased, the age at first coresidential union has remained the same (Manning et al. 2014). The age at first marriage for men is 27.6 and for women is 25.9 while the average age at first cohabitation is 23.5 for men and 21.8 for women (Manning et al. 2014).

There are also well-known correlates of different-sex union formation. African Americans are less likely to cohabit or marry than whites (Carlson, McLanahan, and England 2004; Guzzo 2006; Raley 1996; Raley et al. 2015). Education is associated with higher odds of marriage, but lower odds of cohabitation (Guzzo 2006; Manning et al. 2014; Sassler, Michelmore, and Qian 2018). More educated individuals tend to marry at later ages, but are more likely to marry overall (Manning et al. 2014). Family structure in adolescence is also associated with union formation (Ryan, Franzetta, Schelar, and Manlove 2009). More specifically, living with a single mother is associated with early entry into cohabitation (rather than marriage), living in a cohabiting family is associated with decreased risk of entry into early marriage, and living in a step family is associated with entry into early marriage (Ryan et al. 2009). Moving out of the parental home is also associated with higher odds of heterosexual union formation (Guzzo 2006).

While previous research has found that women enter coresidential unions earlier than men (Manning et al. 2014) it is unclear how sexual minority status might complicate these patterns. Individuals are socialized to search for different-sex partners starting in adolescence (Strohm 2010) and therefore only begin to search for same-sex partners after developing samesex attraction, behaviors, and identities (Heatherington and Lavner 2008). As a result, men and women tend to form same-sex coresidential unions later in life. For example, according to Add Health data (author's calculations), the average age at first same-sex union is 23.7 for men and 22.3 for women, while first different-sex union is 22.8 for men and 21.3 for women. The small population searching for a same-sex partner suggests increased difficulties in finding a match (Lewis and Oppenheimer 2000) and delay same-sex union formation (Strohm 2010).

Same-sex union formation. Limited previous research has used large-scale, quantitative data to examine the correlates of same-sex coresidential union formation and status (Frisch and Hviid 2006; Mernitz and Politt 2018; Rosenfeld and Kim 2005; Strohm 2010). Using British data from the National Child Development Study (NCDS) and the 1920 British Cohort Study (BCS), Strohm (2010) found, based on life table methods, that the rates of entry into same-sex cohabitation increased steadily from age 16 to age 34. In comparison, entry into different-sex cohabitation increased through the early and mid-20s and then leveled off before declining during the early 30s. Men and women were equally likely to enter a same-sex union by age 34 (Strohm 2010). Strohm (2010) also found based on survival models with a rich set of variables that individuals with higher levels of education and occupational prestige were more likely than their less advantaged counterparts to enter a same-sex cohabiting union. Furthermore, individuals who were born in a later cohort and from higher SES areas (London and Southeast of England) had higher odds of entering a same-sex cohabiting union (Strohm 2010). Strohm (2010) points out that these patterns support the perspective that individuals who grew up in social contexts more favorable to same-sex relationships, or with enough resources to move away from unfavorable social contexts, would be more likely to form same-sex unions.

Herek and colleagues (2010) were able to capture sexual orientation and union type by using data from the Knowledge Network panel in their study examining the demographic, psychological, and social characteristics of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) adults in the United States. They found that 29.0 percent of gay men and 3.2 percent of bisexual men were in a samesex coresidential relationship at the time of the interview compared to 61.4 percent of lesbian women and 4.8 percent of bisexual women (Herek et al. 2010). Furthermore, a qualitative and longitudinal study of young women documented substantial fluidity in sexual orientation identity, observing that sexual orientation identity for some women was affected by being in a same-sex relationship (Diamond 2008). Therefore, it is important to examine sexual orientation identity in conjunction with same-sex union formation.

One framework that could explain the influence of context on the union formation of sexual minorities is the minority stress framework (Meyer 1995; Meyer 2003). Pioneering this framework, Meyer (1995) states that sexual minorities, like racial minorities, experience greater levels of stress due to not only to their stigmatized identity, but also their more inhospitable social environments (Frost and Meyer 2009; Meyer 2003). Stigma was originally defined by Goffman (1963) as "an attribute that is deeply discrediting" and that reduces the bearer "from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one" (p. 3). While stigma can be individual or structural, more recent work has addressed structural stigma (see Hatzenbuehler 2014 for a brief review). Structural stigma refers to "societal-level conditions, cultural norms, and institutional policies that constrain the opportunities, resources, and well-being of the stigmatized" (Hatzenbuehler and Link 2014: 2).

Oswald, Cuthbertson, Lazarevic, and Goldberg (2010) build on the minority stress framework to include what they call "community climate" (p. 224). Broadly, they define community climate as "the level of community support for homosexuality, and indicated by objectively measurable phenomenon such as religious and political affiliations, legal rights, workplace opportunities and policies, and the presence of LGBT community members and services" (Oswald et al. 2010: 215). Oswald and colleagues (2010) argue that community climate affects the well-being of LGBT individuals by conveying messages of support or rejection that are then internalized.

Furthermore, lesbians and gay men appear to differ in terms of the particular stressors that they encounter. For example, in the United States, individuals generally hold more positive views of lesbians than gay men (i.e., LaMar and Kite 1998; Worthen 2013) and more individuals agree that two women (with or without children) are a 'family' than two men (with or without children) (Powell, Blozendahl, Geist, and Steelman 2010). In addition, gay men are more likely to be the victim of hate crimes than lesbian women (Herek 2009). Worthen (2013) has outlined several theoretical reasons throughout the literature to explain why attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women differ. For example, heterosexuals often conflate gay and bisexual men with HIV/AIDS but rarely associate this with lesbians which can result in a more negative attitude toward gay men as compared to lesbian women (Worthen 2013). Given these differences, it is important to consider whether the association between social context and same-sex union formation differs for men and women.

Most studies that have examined the effect of contextual factors on outcomes of sexual minorities have focused on indicators of health and well-being (i.e. Duncan and Hatzenbuehler 2014; Everett 2014; Hatzenbuehler, Keyes, and Hasin 2009; Hatzenbuehler et al. 2010). Consistent with the minority stress framework, this research has found more supportive community contexts are associated with more positive outcomes for sexual minorities (Duncan and Hatzenbuehler 2014; Everett 2014; Everett 2014; Hatzenbuehler et al. 2015; Hatzenbuehler, Keyes, and Hasin 2009; Hatzenbuehler et al. 2010). For example, sexual minority youth living in neighborhoods with higher rates of LGBT assault hate crimes were more likely to report suicide ideation and attempts than those in neighborhood with lower levels of LGBT hate crimes

(Duncan and Hatzenbuehler 2010). However, it is unclear whether contextual factors shape the formation of coresidential relationships for sexual minorities. The current research serves to fill this gap by examining how various measures of context are associated with first same-sex union formation among sexual minorities and how the associations differ for men and women.

Family context: Out to parents. Previous research has found "coming out" to be associated with increased mental health benefits (i.e. Kosciw, Palmer, and Kull 2015; Juster et al. 2013; Morris, Waldo, and Rothblum 2001), but also with increased risk of discrimination and homophobia (i.e. Huebner and Davis 2005; Kosciw, et al. 2015; Waldo 1999). For example, Riggle et al. (2017) examined how outness, concealment, and authenticity were associated with distress and well-being. They defined outness as perceptions of who knows about the participant's LGB identity and the quality of communication about the identity with that person or group. They found that LGB-specific concealment was associated with lower psychological well-being and higher depressive symptoms (Riggle et al. 2017). Coming out, specifically to parents, could have strong effects on same-sex union formation, especially among young adults. LaSala (2000) notes, "gay men (and women) may face special difficulties in establishing the intergenerational boundaries necessary to establish functional relationships with partner. Coming out to parents may be an important developmental task distinctive to gay men as well as a necessary precursor to the setting of these boundaries" (p. 64).

Rosenfeld and Kim (2005) argue that the independence of young adults today has reduced parental control over their children's partners. More specifically, they propose that the residential and geographic independence of young adults has made it harder for parents to prevent their children from forming same-sex relationships. Rosenfeld (2007) elaborates that by reducing parental control the independent life stage has resulted in more same-sex couples which has led to greater visibility and normalcy of alternative unions. Although they do not explicitly address the idea of disclosure of sexual orientation identity to parents, Rosenfeld and Kim (2005) and Rosenfeld (2007) highlight the potential power and influence that the family context, specifically parents, can have on same-sex union formation. Relatedly, Strohm (2010) suggests that sexual minorities may delay forming same-sex unions until they have moved away and are independent from their families of origin. Taken together, these findings suggest that the family context, and being out to parents in particular, may be salient for sexual minorities, especially as it relates to union formation.

Demographic context: Same-sex couple concentration. Same-sex coresidential unions are not uniformly distributed across the United States. The majority of same-sex couples, especially gay men, are concentrated in cities (Black et al. 2000; Gates and Ost 2004; Laumann et al. 1994). In fact, the majority of these couples are concentrated in twenty cities (Black et al. 2000). Their concentration not only reflects the fact that sexual minorities are more likely to migrate to cities, but also the greater willingness of individuals to identify as gay and lesbian when they reside in these areas (Gates 2013; Laumann et al. 1994). As demographic studies of same-sex coresidential unions are cross-sectional, it is not clear what accounts for the fact that same-sex couples are concentrated in particular areas. As proposed by Chicago School theories, cities have several features that potentially reduce social and institutional control over the dynamics of relationships (i.e., their size, density, heterogeneity), especially the transience of their populations (Heap 2003; Laumann et al. 2004; Glenn and Shelton 1985). Cities are also said to provide dense mate markets, increasing alternatives to the relationship (Gautier, Svarer, and Teulings 2010).
Studies conducted by the Chicago School almost a century ago noted the fact that gay men tend to congregate in specific areas within cities (Heap 2003). Recent research reveals that within the 100 most populous places, same-sex partner households, especially those with male partners, are segregated from other households at the census tract level. In fact, the segregation of same-sex couples continues to rival economic and racial segregation (Spring 2013). In spite of this segregation, the percent of households comprised of cohabiting same-sex partners is low. For instance, according to U.S. Census data, the percent of same-sex couples in the census tracts comprising the "Boystown" neighborhood in Chicago, one of the most booming gay neighborhoods in the world, ranged from 2.1 percent to 4.0 percent in 2000 and from 1.6 percent to 5.6 percent in 2010 (my own computations). It could be the case that sexual minorities feel more comfortable coresiding in these areas. Alternatively, sexual minorities may gravitate to these areas because they perceive them as more receptive.

Mounting theory and research suggests that the concentration of gays and lesbians in neighborhoods is associated with the dynamics of sexual relationships. The minority stress framework, in particular, suggests that sexual minorities will encounter fewer stressors when they reside in neighborhoods with higher concentrations of same-sex couples (Frost and Meyer 2003). Mixed methods research conducted in Chicago neighborhoods during the 1990s found that short-term sexual encounters between men flourished when opportunities for meeting gay men were greater (Ellingson and Schroeder 2004). As Carpiano et al. (2011) argue, gay neighborhoods provide "a place where gay men can visibly display their gay identity, avoid having to justify themselves to others, and develop romantic and platonic relationships without fear" (p. 76). Rather than focus on urbanicity, I use a measure of same-sex couple concentration as a demographic indicator of supportive environment.

Attitudinal context: Republican voting. Previous research has used county-level voting as an indicator of community climate (e.g., Everett 2014; Oswald et al. 2010). According to Oswald et al. (2010), the overall political climate of an area can be identified through aggregate voting patterns. Previous research has found that individuals with more conservative attitudes and Republicans are less likely to support rights for sexual minorities and have more negative attitudes toward sexual minorities (e.g., Baunach 2012; Herek 2002; Hicks and Lee 2006; McVeigh and Diaz 2008). Furthermore, as highlighted by Oswald and colleagues, the Republican National Committee explicitly opposes same-sex marriage. The Republican official party platform states that "Traditional marriage and family, based on marriage between one man and one woman, is the foundation for a free society and has for millennia been entrusted with rearing children and instilling cultural values." (Republican National Committee 2016: 11). Given this explicit and clear opposition to same-sex marriage, it is reasonable to expect that sexual minorities living in areas with higher concentrations of Republican voters will be less likely than their counterparts residing in areas with lower concentrations of Republican voters to form same-sex coresidential unions.

Current Study

The current study fills a gap in the literature by examining the effect of social context on union formation, with a particular focus on sexual minorities. Drawing on data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, I address the following research question using survival analyses: How are key indicators of social context associated with union formation? To answer this question, I estimate proportional hazards models that predict the timing of forming a first same-sex coresidential union. I expect that sexual minorities living in more supportive contexts will be more likely to form same-sex coresidential unions than their counterparts in less supportive contexts. I stratify my models by sex of respondent to consider whether the effects of covariates differ for men and women in the analyses of union formation. Importantly, my measures of sexual orientation identity and social context correspond to a point in time that precedes the period during which respondents are at risk of forming their first samesex union, as elaborated below. This study will provide a portrait of union formation for a contemporary cohort of young adults.

Data and Methods

See Chapter II for details on the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health.

Analytic sample. Given that sexual orientation identity and contextual measures of samesex couple concentration and Republican voting were not included prior to Wave III, the analytic sample for this research consists of individuals who had not formed a same-sex coresidential union before Wave III. The sample of respondents who completed the first in-home interview (N =20,745) was restricted in several ways. First, I excluded individuals who did not participate in Waves III and IV (n=7,764). Second, I dropped 248 individuals who did not have geocode information. I also excluded 732 individuals who were missing on survey design variables. An additional 120 individuals were not included because they did not provide valid responses to the questions on sexual orientation identity, as elaborated below. Finally, I dropped respondents who had already formed a same-sex coresidential union prior to Wave III (n= 125), as my measures of context correspond to the period when Wave III data were collected. Prior to Wave I, fewer than 10 respondents formed a same-sex union and, between Waves I and III, 34 males and 77 females formed a same-sex union. Respondents who formed a same-sex union prior to Wave III did not differ significantly from sexual minorities who did not form a same-sex union prior to Wave III on any of the variables of interest (see Appendix Table A2.1.). Individuals who did not

form a same-sex coresidential union between Waves III and IV were censored at the time of the Wave IV interview. My final sample includes 11,849 respondents. See Appendix Table A2.2 for specific sample sizes.

To my knowledge, studies have yet to examine how patterns of union formation differ according to sexual orientation identity. Studies of the formation of different-sex unions, in particular, likely include individuals who are not at risk of forming such a union. As the proportion of sexual minorities in the population is small, the inclusion of these individuals is probably inconsequential for model estimates. I restrict my models of same-sex coresidential union formation to individuals who identify as bisexual, mostly homosexual, or 100 percent homosexual. Although Strohm (2010) examined entry into same-sex unions, he did not examine the association between sexual orientation identity and union formation, reflecting the fact that such a measure was not available in the NCDS and BCS. However, he did state the importance of including information on sexual orientation when examining same-sex union formation, especially as an indicator of whether an individual is searching for a same-sex partner (Strohm 2010).

Dependent Variable

First same-sex coresidential union formation. At Wave IV, respondents were asked detailed questions about their cohabitation and marriage histories, including how many individuals they had been married to or living with, as well as start dates (month and year) of cohabitation and marriage for each partner identified.² As noted earlier, respondents were also

² If respondents did not know the start month of their union, they were able to choose a season. Respondents who chose a season were coded as the month in the middle of that season. For example, Spring was coded as April and

asked demographic information about their partner, such as their biological sex. Add Health is one of the only U.S. data sets that enables identification of same-sex relationships based on coresidence (National Center for Family and Marriage Research 2013) and also includes start dates of all coresidential relationships. For example, while the NLSY contains information about union formation, prior to 2005 it only asked about opposite sex unions (Mernitz and Politt 2018). Based on the sex of the respondent (marked by the interviewer) and the sex of their partner (marked by the respondent) a variable indicating type of union (0= different-sex union; 1= samesex union) for each partner was created. For respondents with multiple same-sex partners I included only the partner with the earliest union start date. Next, for each respondent I created a variable that indicated the date of first same-sex union (cohabitation or marriage) in century months. I then constructed a variable that indicated the number of months since the Wave III interview and the time when the respondent first entered a same-sex coresidential union or reached the Wave IV interview (for those who did not form a same-sex union). An alternative modeling strategy would be to focus on the formation of first coresidential union and treat samesex and different-sex unions as competing risks (e.g., Strohm 2010); however, several respondents formed a different-sex union prior to forming a same-sex union.

Independent Variables

Sexual minority status. Sexual minority status was operationalized using the following question from Wave III: "Please choose the description that best fits how you think about yourself: (1) 100 percent heterosexual (straight), (2) mostly heterosexual (straight), but somewhat attracted to people of your own sex, (3) bisexual that is, attracted to men and women

Fall as October. Patterns do not differ when disregarding the information on season and only utilizing month and year.

equally, (4) mostly homosexual (gay), but somewhat attracted to people of the opposite sex, (5) 100 percent homosexual (gay), (6) not sexually attracted to either males or females." Following previous research (i.e., Hatzenbuehler, Jun, Corliss, and Austin 2014), I excluded asexual respondents from my analyses. I recoded sexual minority status into four categories (1) 100 percent heterosexual (straight), (2) mostly heterosexual, but somewhat attracted to people of your own sex, (3) bisexual that is, attracted to men and women equally, and (4) mostly homosexual (gay), but somewhat attracted to people of the opposite sex and 100 percent homosexual (gay). For models of same-sex coresidential union formation, the sample is restricted to individuals who identified as bisexual, mostly homosexual, or 100 percent homosexual.

Contextual Variables

Out to either parent. I use a measure of whether or not the respondent had disclosed their sexual orientation identity to either of their parents as an indicator of family context. This measure was operationalized using the following question that immediately followed the Wave III measure of sexual orientation identity: "Which of your parents knows that you are bisexual/about your homosexuality? Neither parent knows, only mother knows, only father knows, both parents know." Responses were recoded as (0) neither parent knows and (1) only mother knows, only father knows, or both parents know. This question was only asked of respondents who identified as bisexual, mostly homosexual, or 100 percent homosexual.

Same-sex couple concentration. I use the percent of households headed by same-sex unmarried partners in respondent's tract as an indicator of social support for sexual minorities. This measure was obtained from the contextual data appended to the Add Health by Swisher (2008). In supplemental analyses combining data from the U.S. Census and the 1988-2008 General Social Survey, Schwartz and Graf (2010) demonstrated that the percent of same-sex cohabiting couples across different locales was highly correlated with the percent of individuals identifying as gay or lesbian. Following prior work using the Add Health (Everett 2014), I use dummy variables in the models to distinguish different groups of respondents who identified as sexual minority according to the concentration of same-sex couples in their neighborhood. Preliminary analyses indicated that the same-sex couple concentration variable had large right skew and a modal value of zero. Thus, I divided sexual minority men and women into three equally-sized categories (or tertiles) on the basis of the concentration of same-sex cohabiting couples in their census tract. For sexual minority men and women a low concentration tract was less than .003, a medium concentration tract was .003 to .008, and a high concentration tract was greater than .008. In supplemental analyses discussed later, I alternatively include a logged measure of same-sex couple concentration at the tract level. I also examine the effects of state-and county- level same-sex couple concentration in the supplemental analyses.

County-level voting. As an alternative indicator of support for sexual minorities, I measure the percent of votes cast in respondent's county for the Republican presidential candidate during the 2000 election (McVeigh and Diaz 2009). This measure was obtained from the political context database appended to the Add Health by Fowler, Settle, and Monbureau (2010). Preliminary analyses utilized categorical and logged versions of the Republican voting variable. However, following McVeigh and Diaz (2009), I ultimately used a continuous variable which ranged from .090 to .885.

Control Variables.

Consistent with prior work on union formation using Add Health (e.g., Raley, Crissey, and Muller 2007) I include controls for age, race, and family background.

Age at wave III. I include a variable for respondent's exact age at Wave III.

Race/Ethnicity. Race/ethnicity of respondent was collected from the first wave of the study and recoded to a series of dummy variables (non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic other) with non-Hispanic white acting as the reference group.

Living with two biological parents. Based on the household roster at Wave I, I established if a respondent was living with both biological parents at Wave I.

Family SES. Family SES is based on a measure developed by Bearman and Moody (2004) that incorporates information on parental education and occupation from Wave I; this measure is widely used in studies based on Add Health.

Migration. Following Ueno, Vaghela, and Ritter (2014) I include an indicator of whether or not the respondent moved more than 50 miles between Waves I and III. This measure was obtained from the contextual data appended to the Add Health by Swisher (2008) that included geographical distances between waves. Respondents were coded as (1) migrated if they moved 50 miles or more between Waves I and III or (0) did not migrate if they did not.

Analytic Strategy

I begin with a descriptive profile of men and women who identify as sexual minority (bisexual, mostly/100 percent homosexual) and sexual majority (mostly/100 percent heterosexual) at Wave III, contrasting how they compare on same-sex union history, contextual variables, and control variables. I then turn to survival analysis to examine the timing of samesex union formation. Specifically, I display weighted estimates of the proportion of heterosexuals, bisexuals, and homosexuals who have formed a same-sex coresidential union between Waves III and IV. Next, I present the hazard ratios from Cox models of same-sex coresidential union formation that adjust for survey design effects. The risk period for the models begins with the Wave III interview and ends in the month that the respondent formed their first same-sex union formation (if the respondent formed a same-sex union) or the month of the Wave IV interview.

Results

Descriptive results. Table 3.1 displays sample means for the all men, all women, heterosexual men, heterosexual women, sexual minority men, and sexual minority women. As documented in prior studies, men are more likely than women to identify as homosexual (i.e., 1.4 percent versus 0.7 percent) whereas women are more likely than men to identify as bisexual (i.e., 2.2 percent versus 0.6 percent). In addition, greater shares of women than men identity as sexual minority overall (2.9 percent versus 2.0 percent). This is consistent with the recent report by Gates (2017), which states that more woman than men in the United States identify as LGBT (4.4 percent versus 3.7 percent). Results of significance tests indicate that heterosexual and sexual minority groups do not differ significantly from each other on any of the variables except for union formation.

Considering my key outcome, I see dramatic differences in union formation by sexual orientation identity for male and female respondents. Only 1 percent of heterosexual women formed a same-sex coresidential union prior to Wave IV, versus 10.7 percent of sexual minority women. Heterosexual male respondents were the least likely of any group to have formed a same-sex coresidential union, with 0.3 percent doing so prior to Wave IV (versus 31.7 percent of sexual minority men). Regarding the contextual variables, sexual minority men are more often than sexual minority women to be out to either parent (55.5 percent versus 45.8 percent). This is consistent with previous research by the Pew Research Center (2013) which found that gay men were more likely to be out to their mother or their father than lesbian women. This also partly reflects the fact that sexual minority men are more likely than sexual minority women to identify

as homosexual. When looking at the control variables there are a few noticeable differences between heterosexuals and sexual minorities. Greater shares of sexual minority women are white than heterosexual women (78.2 percent versus 69.2 percent). Greater percentages of heterosexual men reported living with two biological parents at Wave I than sexual minority men (58.6 percent versus 47.3 percent). Sexual minority men more often reported moving more than 50 miles between Waves I and III than heterosexual men (35.9 percent versus 25.6 percent).

Figure 3.1 shows results from weighted life table analyses of same-sex coresidential union formation for four sexual orientation groups. Following previous studies (e.g., Everett and Mollborn 2014), I collapsed mostly homosexual and 100 percent homosexual. The *x*-axis shows the number of months since the Wave III interview and the *y*-axis shows the cumulative proportion of individuals who have entered a same-sex coresidential union by a given month. The figure revels that there is a clear association between sexual orientation identity and same-sex union formation. Among both men and women, mostly/100 percent homosexual respondents are most likely to form a same-sex union, followed by bisexuals, with mostly and 100 percent heterosexual respondents the least likely to form a same-sex union. Additionally analyses (not shown) examined same-sex coresidential union formation among all individuals, including those who formed a same-sex union prior to Wave III. The same pattern of same-sex union formation by sexual orientation identity was found.

As a "check" to ensure my approach captures the process for different-sex union formation I also ran weighted life table analyses of different-sex coresidential union formation for the four sexual orientation groups (not shown). Among men and women, 100 percent heterosexual, mostly heterosexual, and bisexual respondents are the most likely to form a different-sex union, while 100 percent/mostly homosexual respondents are the least likely to form a different-sex union. Over half of heterosexual and bisexual respondents formed a different-sex union by Wave IV. In contrast, less than 10 percent of homosexual respondents formed a different-sex union by the Wave IV interview.

Multivariate results. Table 3.2 displays the hazard ratios from Cox models of first samesex union formation. One set of columns displays the hazard ratios for sexual minority (bisexual, mostly/100 percent homosexual) men while the other set displays the hazard ratios for sexual minority women. Model 1 displays the out to either parent variable and the control variables. Model 2 includes the tract same-sex concentration dummies and control variables. Model 3 includes Republican voting at the county level and the control variables. Model 4 represents the full model and includes all three sets of contextual variables.

The results from Model 1 reveal that sexual minority men and women who are out to either parent have a significantly higher hazard rate of forming a first same-sex union compared to those who are not out to either parent. Specifically, sexual minority men who are out to either parent have a hazard rate of forming a same-sex coresidential union that is roughly five times higher than that of those who are not out, while sexual minority women who are out have a hazard rate that is four times higher. An advantage of this analysis is that the indicator of coming out precedes the transition to coresidence; however, respondents who plan to move in with a partner may feel pressure to come out to their parents.

My demographic indicator of supportive context, same-sex couple concentration, is significant for sexual minority men but not women. Model 2 shows that sexual minority men who live in tracts with medium and higher concentrations of same-sex couples have significantly higher hazard rates of forming a first same-sex union than those in tracts with low concentrations of same-sex couples. More specifically, sexual minority men living in tracts with the highest concentration of same-sex couples have almost three times higher hazard rates of forming a first same-sex union and sexual minority men living in tracts with a medium concentration have three times higher hazard rates of forming a first same-sex union than sexual minority men who live in tracts with the lowest concentration of same-sex couples.

Model 3 substitutes the proportion of the county voting for the Republican presidential nominee for the same-sex couple concentration tract variables. Republican voting is not significantly associated with same-sex union formation for sexual minority men or women. At the zero-order level, however, Republican voting was marginally significantly related to hazard rates of union formation for sexual minority men (results not shown).

Model 4 presents results from the full model that combines all three sets of contextual variables. For sexual minority men, being out to either parent continues to be significantly higher hazard rate of forming a first same-sex union. In the full model, sexual minority men who are out to their parents have about five times higher hazard rates of forming a first same-sex union than those who are not. Furthermore, same-sex couple concentration remains significantly associated with same-sex union formation. In fact, sexual minority men living in a tract with a high concentration of same-sex couples have almost three times higher hazard rates of forming a first same-sex couples. Turning my attention to sexual minority women, being out to either parent remains significantly associated with higher hazards of forming a first same-sex union. More specifically, sexual minority women who are out to either parent have over four times higher hazard rates of forming a first same-sex union that those who are not to either parent have over four times higher hazard rates of forming a first same-sex union that those who are not out.

Supplemental analyses. I also conducted several sensitivity analyses that are not displayed in this chapter. I ran parallel sets of left-truncated models that began the risk period

with the exact age at Wave III and using as a timing variable the age at first same-sex union formation (or age at Wave IV interview if censored). The hazard ratios and significance levels were virtually identical. I present the results for the models that capture timing in months because descriptive life table estimates cannot adjust for left-truncation. In addition, I ran models that included measures of same-sex concentration at the state and county levels. These variables (recoded into high, medium, and low concentration) were not significant for sexual minority men or women. I also utilized a linear specification of same-sex concentration in census tract that logged the original variable (after adding .001). This variable was significant in all models for sexual minority men but not sexual minority women.

As a falsification test, I substituted in my models a variable for concentration of differentsex couples and failed to detect any significant effects for sexual minority men or women. Drawing on Rosenfeld's (2007) premise that independence from family and geographic mobility has led to an increase in same-sex couples I ran models that additionally included an interaction between the logged same-sex concentration variable with geographic mobility. This interaction term was not significant for sexual minority men or women. This means that the effect of samesex neighborhood concentration does not differ for men or women based on their mobility.

Next, I examined how education and religiosity were associated with same-sex union formation. Since Add Health does not include dates of degree completion at Wave IV, I was unable to include a time-varying covariate for education. Instead I included an indicator for educational attainment at Wave IV, which was not significantly associated with same-sex union formation for sexual minority men and women. Religiosity was not significantly associated with same-sex union formation for sexual minority women. However, religiosity was significantly associated with same-sex union formation for sexual minority men. Sexual minority men who were more religious had significantly higher hazards of forming a same-sex union at both the zero-order and when included in the full model.

Finally, I examined the effects of contextual factors in analogous models of different-sex union formation among heterosexuals who had not formed such a union at the time of the Wave III interview. First, the proportion of unmarried opposite-sex couples at the tract level was not associated with union formation at the zero-order or multivariate level for heterosexual men or women. However, the proportion of the county voting Republican was associated with differentsex union formation among heterosexual men and women in both the zero-order and multivariate models. Consistent with previous research on context and the second demographic transition (Lesthaeghe and Neidert 2006), further analysis revealed that proportion voting Republican was significantly associated with higher hazard rates of marrying and lower hazard rates of cohabiting among heterosexual men and women.

Discussion

The social landscape surrounding sexual minorities and, more broadly, union formation has been rapidly changing in the past two decades. During this time the average age at marriage has risen (U.S. Census Bureau 2016) and sexual minorities have progressed from no states legally recognizing relationships to marriage equality in 2015 (Human Rights Campaign 2015). Even with these changes, no known studies have directly examined the relationship between sexual orientation identity and union formation. In addition, despite the documented importance of context for sexual minorities, studies have yet to directly examine the effects of contextual factors on first same-sex union formation in the United States. Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, and guided by a minority stress framework, this research sought to fill two major gaps in our understanding of union formation. Overall, I found that family context mattered for both sexual minority men and women. About half of sexual minority young adults were out to their parents while half were not; being out had clear implications for their union formation. Almost half (48.4percent) of sexual minority men who were out to either parent formed a same-sex union compared to fewer than one-sixth (14percent) of sexual minority men who were not out (results not shown). Among sexual minority women, over one-fifth (20.7percent) who were out to either parent form a samesex union compared to less than one-tenth (10.9 percent) of sexual minority women who were not out to either parent (results not shown). As shown in the analyses, respondents who were out to either parent had significantly higher hazards of forming a same-sex union than those who were not. This finding is consistent with previous research by Rosenfeld and Kim (2005) and Strohm (2010) which suggests that the family of origin has a critical influence on same-sex union formation.

My demographic indicator of supportive context, same-sex couple concentration, mattered for sexual minority men, but not women. Sexual minority men living in tracts with higher concentrations of same-sex couples had significantly higher hazards of forming a first same-sex union that those living in tracts with low concentrations of same-sex couples. This finding is consistent with the minority stress framework which suggested that sexual minorities would be more likely to form unions in areas with more social and institutional support. My attitudinal measure of supportive context, county-level Republican voting, was only marginally significantly associated with same-sex union formation for sexual minority men. Republican voting reduced their hazard rates of forming these unions in the zero-order model, but the effect fell out of significance with inclusion of control variables. I had expected that respondents residing in counties with lower proportions of voters who cast a vote for the Republican candidate (Bush) would be more likely to form coresidential unions. This political indicator of context has been important in other work on depression (Everett 2014), but does not appear to be influential for this outcome beyond the zero-order level.

Previous research found that gay men were more sensitive than lesbian women to context (Fischer, Kalmijn, and Steinmetz 2016). More specifically, Fischer et al. (2016) found across nine European countries that men in same-sex relationships (both cohabiting and not), social well-being (or overall sense of social embedders and absence of ill-being), was significantly dependent on institutional context (tolerance as a normative concept), while women in same-sex relationships social well-being was not. Context may be less critical to sexual minority women because they face fewer barriers to being a couple in public. As stated earlier, in a prior study gay men were more likely than lesbians to report they were the victim of a hate crime, which is evidence that their day-to-day environments are more hostile (Herek 2009). Similarly, gay male couples reported more stress related to violence/harassment than did lesbian couples (Todosijevic, Rothblum, and Solomon 2005).

While this paper provides new insights into union formation for sexual minorities, several limitations exist. First, the sample was limited to individuals who had not formed a same-sex union prior to Wave III of Add Health; thus, I did not capture the experiences of respondents who formed a first same-sex union earlier in the life course. Second, the question regarding disclosure of sexual orientation identity was only asked about parents and did not address parental reaction to coming out. Some respondents who were out to either parent may have experienced negative reactions that impeded their union formation of same-sex unions. Relatedly, Add Health did not ask if the respondent was out to anyone else. It may be the case that disclosure to other groups (such as friends or at work) influences union formation in unique

ways. Third, my measures of social context came from the 2000 Census and thus fail to capture change during the period of risk that resulted from either respondents changing contexts or their contexts changing over time. Ideally, I would have examined the effects of sex-specific measures of same-sex couple concentration; however, other studies concerning the influence of same-sex couple concentration do not make this distinction (e.g., Baumle and Compton 2011; Frye et al. 2010). Due to the period of observation (roughly 2000 to 2008), I did not examine the formation of same-sex marital unions but consider this an important topic for future research. Finally, given the timing of my contextual indicators and the limited information asked of sexual orientation identity, I did not capture the full range of relationships. For example, transgender, queer, asexual, and nonbinary individuals were not specifically examined in this study.

Despite these limitations, this research possesses many strengths. First, Add Health contains a larger number of sexual minorities and individuals in same-sex relationships than most other large datasets. For example, the most recent SIPP data only includes approximately 200 same-sex couples across a wide age span (18-64). The sizeable and significant contextual effects that I found for men are reassuring in light of the fact that the number of sexual minority men in my sample is smaller than the number of sexual minority women. In addition, respondents were asked detailed questions about their cohabitation and marriage histories, allowing for a comprehensive examination of same-sex union formation. Importantly, the contextual data available with Add Health available at Wave III allowed me to examine the effects of social context on union formation prior to the period of risk.

In summary, I find that context matters for same-sex coresidential union formation. Sexual minorities, especially men, have higher likelihood of forming a first same-sex union the more supportive their context. My findings illustrate the importance of considering context when examining outcomes for sexual minorities, particularly union formation. As the social and cultural landscape of the United States continues to transform, understanding contextual factors is an important focus for future research on sexual minority health and well-being.



	Men				Women						
Variable	All Men (n=5,414)	Heterosexual (n=5,266)		Sexual Minority (n=119)	All Women (n=6,382)	Heterosexual (n=6,161)		Sexual Minority (n=183)			
	%/Mean	%/Mean		%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean		%/Mean			
Same-Sex Union Formation	0.96	0.32	***	31.66	1.29	1.02	***	10.77			
Sexual Identity (W3)											
100% heterosexual	94.61	95.59		_	86.43	88.88		_			
Mostly heterosexual	3.35	3.41		_	10.71	11.12		_			
Bisexual	0.60	_		28.91	2.20	_		76.62			
Mostly homosexual	0.63	_		30.86	0.45	_		15.73			
100% homosexual	0.82	_		40.23	0.22	_		7.65			
Context Variables											
Out to either parent	_	_		55.51	_	_		45.80			
Proportion voting Republican (county)	0.49	0.50		0.45	0.49	0.49		0.47			
Concentration same-sex households (tract)											
Low	37.49	37.35		37.26	38.38	38.71		35.84			
Medium	40.71	40.94		32.18	40.07	40.01		37.85			
High	21.80	21.71		30.55	21.56	21.29		26.31			
Control Variables											
Age at Wave III	22.40	22.40		22.20	22.16	22.17		21.88			
Race/Ethnicity											
Non-Hispanic white	68.37	68.60		65.98	69.38	69.22		78.25			
Non-Hispanic black	14.12	13.92		13.35	14.85	14.92		7.34			
Hispanic	11.96	11.92		14.37	11.14	58.06		11.99			
Non-Hispanic other	5.55	5.56		6.30	4.63	4.72		2.42			
Two biological parents (W1)	58.36	58.66		47.32	57.97	58.06		53.95			
Family SES (1-10)	5.60	5.61		5.68	5.50	5.51		5.27			
Migrate (more than 50 miles)	25.69	25.61		35.86	25.23	25.35		25.91			

Table 3.1. Descriptive Statitics by Sex and Sexual Identity for Same-Sex Union Formation (N=11,728)

Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001 (two-tailed tests between heterosexual and sexual minority respondents)

Respondents with Wave 1, 3, and 4 Interviews with No Same-Sex Coresidential Union History at Wave 3

	Sexual Minority Men (N=119)							Sexual Minority Women (N=183)								
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	Model 4		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		
Out to Either Parent	5.677	*				5.083	*	4.274	**					4.195	**	
Proportion Same-Sex Couples (Tract)																
Low Concentration			_			_				_				_		
Medium Concentration			3.608	*		2.489				3.237				3.742		
High Concentration			2.941	*		2.725	*			2.545				2.475		
Proportion Voting Republican (County)					0.188	0.56						0.242		0.415		
Controls																
Age at Wave III	1.337	*	1.368	*	1.238	1.305	*	0.620	**	0.638	**	0.639	**	0.627	**	
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	_		_		_	_		_		_		_		_		
Non-Hispanic Black	1.065		0.726		0.759	0.993		3.353	*	3.622	Ť	4.016	*	3.001		
Hispanic	0.468		0.469		0.583	0.424		3.637	Ť	4.494	*	3.652	Ť	5.485	*	
Other	0.881		0.583		0.724	0.709		6.574	*	7.891	*	9.864	*	4.467	†	
Living with Two Biological Parents	2.260	Ť	2.058	Ť	1.666	2.692	†	0.774		0.648		0.600		0.716		
Family SES	1.044		1.055		1.060	1.058		1.151		1.182		1.168		1.167		
Moved 50+ Miles	0.759		0.782		0.995	0.535		4.311	**	4.257	**	4.479	**	4.787	**	

Table 3.2. Hazard Ratios from Cox Models of First Same-Sex Union: Sexual Minority Respondents

Notes: Survey-adjusted models. † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

CHAPTER IV. SEXUAL MINORITIES, RELATIONSHIP CONTEXT, AND THE LABOR MARKET

While momentous gains were made on June 26, 2015 when the United States Supreme Court ruled on *Obergefell v. Hodges*, effectively allowing same-sex marriage in all states, there are still numerous rights and benefits not afforded to same-sex couples (Allen 2015; Human Rights Campaign 2017). Perhaps most notably, there is no federal law protecting sexual minorities from employment discrimination. Despite dozens of court rulings in favor of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) related discrimination protections (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 2017) as of May 2018, 17 states do not provide any protection against employment discrimination based on sexual orientation (Human Rights Campaign 2018). As a result individuals can and do face serious discrimination, including being fired on the basis of sexual orientation (Human Rights Campaign 2015). For example, 15 to 43 percent of LGBT employees have experienced some form of discrimination on the job and 8 to 17 percent of LGBT workers have reported being passed over for a job or fired because of their sexual orientation or gender identity (Burns and Krehely 2011).

Despite the lack of legal protections and increased risk of discrimination and stigmatization, sexual minorities comprise an increasingly large proportion of the workforce, with estimates ranging from 4 to 17 percent (Sawyer et al. 2015; Day and Schoenrade 2000; Ragins et al. 2007). Sexual minority (LGBT) employees are one of the largest, but least studied, minority groups in the workforce (Ragins 2004; Ozeren 2014). Ozeren (2014) concludes, on the basis of his systematic review of the literature, that labor market outcomes and experiences are influenced by sexual orientation; however, little is known about how context moderates this relationship. Furthermore, he notes that the experiences of bisexual employees have received less attention than those of gay and lesbian employees (Ozeren 2014).

Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), I examine how bisexual and homosexual men and women compare to their heterosexual counterparts on both employment and wages. I also bridge prior studies that examine sexual minorities in different ways by intersecting identity and couple type to examine the association between relationship type (different-sex married, different-sex cohabiting, same-sex coresidential, heterosexual single, bisexual single, and homosexual single) and labor market outcomes among men and women from Add Health. This study contributes to the limited research on sexual minorities in the labor force by considering the heterogeneity of sexual minority men and women (e.g., homosexual versus bisexual), and their relationship context. *Background*

Wage penalties, premiums, and discrimination. Wages, and thus wage penalties and premiums, have been shown to be affected by supply and demand (Auclert and Rognlie 2018; Johnson 1997; Katz and Murphy 1992; Piore 1973). Wage penalties refer to the gap in average salary between two groups (for example mothers versus nonmothers) (Budig 2012). Wage premiums refer to the additional average salary one group earns relative to another (for example college graduates versus high school graduates) (James 2012). Previous research on the explanations for wage penalties and premiums classify the explanation for these largely into two groups: worker explanations (supply) and discrimination explanations (demand) (Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007). Worker explanations seek to identify differences in the traits, skills, and behaviors of two or more groups (for example mothers versus nonmothers) while discrimination explanations seek to explain the different preference for and treatment of two or more groups (such as mothers and nonmothers) (Correll et al. 2007). Previous research on wage penalties, from the worker explanation perspective, control for all factors that could be associated with wages, such as human capital, parenthood, and marriage, so then the residual can be attributed to

discrimination (Allegretto and Arthur 2001; Antecol, Jong, and Steinberger 2008; Baumle and Poston 2011; Blandford 2003; Carpenter 2005; Cain and Leppel 2001; Cushing-Daniels and Yrung 2009; Mize 2016).

Discrimination explanations for wage penalties have received less attention in the literature (Correll et al. 2007). As Budig and England (2001) note, social science research virtually never has direct measures of self-reported discrimination. Budig and England (2001) explain how the motherhood penalty is discrimination because women are placed in less rewarding jobs, promoted less, or paid less because of their motherhood status. The same logic could be applied to sexual minorities who may be placed in certain jobs, promoted less, or paid less because of their identity as a sexual minority. In addition, Budig and England (2001) note that discrimination could affect accumulation of experience. Therefore, controls of human capital could offer a conservative estimate on wage penalties, because discrimination could influence human capital investments. Furthermore, several studies have also examined employment discrimination (specifically of sexual minorities) through experimental design by sending pairs of resumes, one indicating participation in a gay organization and the other not, to various job postings and assessing employer responses (Tilcsik 2011; Weichselbaumer 2001).

Gaps in wages among individuals in different-sex couples have been well documented in terms of several characteristics. For example, the majority of previous research has found a wage premium for men in different-sex marriages compared to both never married and divorced men (Cheng 2016; Chun and Lee 2001; Cohen 2002; Cornwell and Rupert 1997; Ginther and Zavodny 2001; Hersch and Stratton 2000; Killewald and Gough 2013; Korenman and Neumark 1991 cited in Killewald and Lundberg 2017). According to Becker (1991) wives' contributions to unpaid labor allow husbands to increase efforts in paid labor, thus increasing husbands' wages relative to unpartnered men (Killewald and Lundberg 2017). According to Maroto and Aylsworth (2017), individuals without partners tend to have the greatest wealth penalties (Schmidt and Sevak 2006; Yamokoski and Keister 2006; Denton and Boos 2007). More specifically, single women with and without relatives living in the household had less wealth than single men (Maroto and Aylsworth 2017).

There are also well established gaps in wages by parental status among different-sex couples, particularly for mothers (Anderson, Binder, and Krause 2002; Budig and England 2001; Lundberg and Rose 2000; Waldfogel 1997; Waldfogel 1998). Overall, previous research finds that women experience a motherhood wage gap with the birth of a child (Anderson, Binder, and Krause 2002; Budig and England 2001; Lundberg and Rose 2000; Waldfogel 1997; Waldfogel 1998). Previous research has also often found a fatherhood "premium", that is, an increase in wages accompanying the birth of a child for men (Glauber 2008; Hersch and Stratton 2000; Hodges and Budig 2010; Lundberg and Rose 2000; Lundberg and Rose 2002). Interestingly, Killewald (2012) found that married, residential, biological fatherhood was associated with wage gains, but unmarried residential fatherhood, nonresidential fathers, and stepfathers did not receive a fatherhood premium. Taken together these findings suggest the importance of relationship context when considering wages.

Sexual minorities and wages. Much of previous research on sexual minorities in the labor market has focused on wages (i.e., Allegretto and Arthur 2001; Badgett 1995; Baumle and Poston 2011; Berg and Lin 2002; Black et al. 2000; 2003; Blandford 2003; Cain and Leppel 2001; Carpenter 2005; Clarke and Sevak 2013; Cushing-Daniels and Yeung 2009; Martell and Hansen 2014; Martell and Hansen 2017; Mize 2016; Poston and Rollman-Tinajero 2018; Sabia 2014). However, several conceptual and methodological issues have been raised by previous. For example, Klawitter (2015) conducted a meta-analysis and explained how the sample size of gay men included in a study, how sexual orientation was measured, and controls for work intensity all explained the variation across studies in reported wage penalty for gay men. The major conceptual and methodological issue that has been raised by previous researchers is the operationalization of sexual minority status. As highlighted by Martell and Hansen (2014), although two decades of research on sexual minorities in the labor market have concluded that lesbian women earn more than heterosexual women, nearly all the research is based upon data that does not ask about sexual orientation identity. Rather, researchers have relied on gender information from reports of cohabitation status or sexual behavior (Martell and Hansen 2014). For example, early work using the General Social Survey classified individuals as a sexual minority if they reported more same-sex sexual partners than different-sex sexual partners (Badgett 1995; Black et al. 2000; Berg and Lin 2002). Similarly, previous work using data from the U.S. Census operationalizes gay men and lesbian women based on cohabitation partners (Allegretto and Arthur 2001; Cain and Leppel 2001; Klawitter and Flatt 1998; Baumle and Poston 2011). For example, Allegretto and Arthur (2001) included individuals in the homosexual sample if a household occupant was not related to the head of the household, marked themselves as an unmarried partner, and were the same sex as the head of household. Similarly, Poston and Rollman-Tinajero (2018) classified individuals as "gay men" or "lesbian women" if they reported being in a same-sex unmarried or married partner relationship.

Classifying sexual minorities based only on cohabitation is not ideal because it fails to identity homosexual respondents who are not currently living with a partner. According to Jones (2016) half of all LGBT adults are single. In addition, gay men who cohabit are a select group, and more often possess characteristics that are linked to stability, such as higher levels of income, than lesbians (Manning and Joyner Forthcoming). Classifying sexual minorities based on sexual behavior is also not ideal because it does not capture sexually inactive homosexuals and includes individuals who would not identify as sexual minorities (Martell and Hansen 2014). Martell and Hansen (2017) find that misclassification of sexual minorities may lead to erroneous conclusions about labor market outcomes, specifically for lesbians. For example, Carpenter (2005) is one of the only U.S. studies to find a statistically significant wage *penalty* for lesbian women, and is also one of the only studies to use self-reported identity, rather than sexual behavior as a measure of sexual minority status.

Previous research on labor market outcomes for sexual minorities has also been limited by narrow definitions of sexual minority that conflate bisexuality with homosexuality. Given that most previous research has been based on cohabitation and sexual behavior (see above), the majority of research fails to separate bisexuals from gay men and lesbian women. Several exceptions are Badgett (2001), Berg and Lien (2002), Carpenter (2005), Mize (2016) and Sabia (2014). When bisexual men and women are examined separately from heterosexuals, gay men, and lesbians, they are found to have lower wages. For example, Carpenter (2005) found some evidence that bisexual men and women earn less than their heterosexual counterparts.

The two main data sources used for examining wage penalties and premiums among sexual minorities are the General Social Survey and the U.S. Census (Martell and Hansen 2014). Badgett (1995) was the first to examine wages of sexual minorities with population-based data. Using General Social Survey data, she estimated a wage regression that included a dummy variable for sexual minorities (anyone with more same-sex partners than different-sex partners) separately for men and women (Badgett 1995). The estimated effect of homosexuality on annual earning was significant and negative, thus providing the first empirical support of a wage penalty for sexual minorities (Badgett 1995). However, homosexuality was operationalized as individuals who reported more same-sex sexual partners than different-sex sexual partners (Badgett 1995). This is one of several methodological issues (outlined above) present in previous research examining wage discrimination among sexual minorities. The majority of studies have used OLS regression to examine wage differentials within these data sets that include control variables for education, potential experience, race/ethnicity, urban/rural location, children, and hours worked (e.g., Allegretto and Arthur 2001; Antecol, Jong, and Steinberger 2008; Baumle and Poston 2011; Blandford 2003; Carpenter 2005; Cushing-Daniels and Yrung 2009; Mize 2016). Overall, there has been a well-documented pattern of wage penalties for men classified as gay, compared to men classified as, and a wage premium for lesbian women, compared to heterosexual women (Berg and Lien 2002; Black et al. 2003; Blanford 2003; Cain and Leppel 2001). Klawitter (2015) conducted a meta-analysis using 31 studies from 1995-2012 that examined sexual orientation and wages and found that, on average, studies reported an 11 percent penalty for gay men and a 9 percent premium for lesbian women.

A recent example of work on sexual minorities and the labor market that takes into account both multiple measures of sexual minority status as well as bisexuality is Mize (2016). Using data from the General Social Survey and Add Health, Mize (2016) examines the association between sexual orientation and wages among individuals who were working at least 10 hours per week. He finds that men and women who identity as homosexual or bisexual have lower wages than their counterparts who identify as heterosexual (Mize 2016). Mize (2016) notes that these differences are not because of human capital (education, race, region, age, parental status, marriage, cohabitation, and occupational category). In fact, only 41 percent of the difference in wages is explained by differences in human capital. However, the wage penalty often found for gay men and wage premium found for lesbian women is largely due to differences in marriage, cohabitation, and childrearing (Mize 2016).

More specifically, decomposition analyses revealed that even if bisexual men and women had the same education, race, region, occupational category, age, parenthood status, marriage/cohabitation, part-time work, and student status as heterosexual men and women, they would still be paid less (Mize 2016). Mize (2016) also examined how perceived prejudice mediated the relationship between bisexuality and wages. He found that perceptions of being treated with less respect, feeling disliked, and perceived social isolation all explained some of the observed wage gaps for bisexual men and women (Mize 2016). He concludes that part of the wage gap observed for bisexual men and women can be explained by perceived prejudice (Mize 2016).

While Mize (2016) examined sexual minorities in terms of identity, sexual behavior, and attraction, he did not consider couple type. That is, he did not examine how individuals in samesex cohabiting couples differed from those in different-sex cohabiting and married couples, regardless of sexual orientation identity, behavior, or attraction. Rather, he included two dummies, one for married and one for cohabitation (regardless of gender), as control variables. This approach fails to capture the linked nature of identity and relationship status. It is possible that it is not the bisexual identity that is related to lower wages, but rather the relationship status of sexual minorities that influence wages. The current study goes beyond Mize (2016) and fills this gap in the literature by including a measure of couple type that combined both identity and couple composition (different-sex married, different-sex cohabiting, same-sex coresidential, heterosexual single, bisexual single, and homosexual single).

Sexual minorities and employment. While numerous previous studies have examined sexual minority wages (see above), occupation (Badgett 1995; Baumle 2013; Blandford 2003; Ueno, Roach, and Pena-Talamantes 2013; Ueno, Pena-Talamantes, and Roach 2013; Tilcisk et al. 2015) and employment discrimination (Badgett, Lau, Sears, and Ho 2007; Day and Schoenrade 2000; Ozeren 2014; Waldo 1999) these studies, by their nature, require individuals included in the sample to be employed. For example, Ueno, Pena-Talamantes, and Roach (2013) examined how sexual orientation contributes to occupational status disparities using Add Health. Occupational status was operationalized by converting standard occupational codes into occupation status scores using the Nam-Power-Boyd Occupational Status Scale (Ueno et al. 2013). They find that the relationship between sexual orientation and occupational status depends on gender, measurement of sexual orientation, and timing of first sexual experience. For example, women who report first same-sex attraction or sexual contact in young adulthood have lower occupational status than women who do not (Ueno et al. 2013). On the other hand, men who report first same-sex dating in young adulthood have higher occupational status than those who do not (Ueno et al. 2013). Overall, Ueno et al. (2013) conclude that sexual orientation operates differently from other occupational dimensions, such as gender and race. However, Ueno et al. (2013) excluded all individuals who had not worked since 2001 from their analysis.

Given their stigmatized position, sexual minorities are more likely to be the group of individuals who are not employed and thus excluded from analyses. For example, while people of color (anyone who is non-Hispanic white) are more likely to be jobless overall, LGBT people of color are even more likely to be jobless (Penn 2013). More specifically, unemployment rates are higher for African Americans (15 percent vs. 12 percent), Latinos/as (14 percent vs. 11 percent), and Asian Pacific Islanders (11 percent vs. 8 percent) who identify as LGBT compared to non-LGBT individuals (Kastanis and Gates 2013a; Kastanis and Gates 2013b; Kastanis and Gates 2013c). There is currently a dearth of literature examining the association between sexual orientation and employment using large probability-based samples. Sabia (2014) found asexual men were significantly less likely to be in the labor force, but the correlation between bisexual identity and employment, as well as gay identity and employment, were not significantly different from zero. Among women, bisexuals and asexuals were significantly less likely to be employed, but the correlation between lesbian identity and employment was not significantly different from zero (Sabia 2014). Using data from the Growing Up Today Study, Charlton and colleagues (2016) found that mostly heterosexuals and bisexuals were significantly more likely to be unemployed when compared to 100 percent heterosexuals. However, gay/lesbian respondents were not significantly different from 100 percent heterosexuals when it came to unemployment (Charlton et al. 2016). As with wages, this highlights the importance of examining bisexual respondents separately from lesbian and gay respondents.

Using data from the 2008 General Social Survey, Sears and Mallory (2011) note that almost half (42 percent) of the LGB-identified respondents reported experiencing at least one form of employment discrimination because of sexual orientation. Next, they summarized findings from non-probability surveys measuring employment discrimination against LGBT people from 2005-2010 and found between 13 percent and 47 percent of respondents were denied employment on the basis of sexual orientation. Employment discrimination included being fired, denied employment, being harassed, or being denied a promotion on the basis of their sexual orientation or gender identity (Sears and Mallory 2011).

Sexual minorities may find their career options limited by attempting to mitigate the potential for negative outcomes (Kaplan 2014). Sexual minorities must make employment and

career decisions in an environment based on the potential for discrimination (Human Rights Campaign Foundation 2007; Ragins, Singh, and Cornwell2007; Tejeda 2006) and stigmatization (Beatty and Kirby 2006; Croteau, Anderson, and VanderWal 2008; Ragins and Cornwell 2001; Shore et al. 2009) (cited in Kapan 2014: 119). Similarly, Leppel (2014) concludes that while individuals prefer jobs with higher earnings, sexual minorities often have to choose between a job that offers more money and a job that offers greater safety. These points underscore the importance of context, especially for sexual minorities, and is echoed by other research on sexual minorities and the labor market. For example, Goldberg and Sayer (2006) note the employment discrimination faced by sexual minorities, and state that the work environment, including relationships with coworkers and supervisors, can be particularly stressful for lesbians. It is also possible that sexual minorities may be fired, forced to quit, or unable to find employment as a result of discrimination. Given the specific challenges faced by this minority group, it is important to examine employment of sexual minorities, and how they compare to heterosexuals. *Current Study*

As shown above, previous research on sexual minorities in the labor market has been largely based on coresidential measures to establish sexual minority status, combines homosexuals and bisexuals, is limited to individuals currently working, and does not consider the influence of relationship context. This current study fills a gap in the literature by examining the effect of relationship context on labor market outcomes, with a particular focus on sexual minorities. Add Health contain a higher number of sexual minorities than many other large datasets (i.e. SIPP), it also contains multiple measures of sexual orientation (including identity and relationship history). Drawing on data from Adult Health, I will address the following research questions: (1) How is sexual minority status (identity and union-type) associated with employment? (2) How is sexual minority status (identity and union-type) associated with wages?

Minority stress and ecological systems theory suggest that individuals in a same-sex union should experience the worst outcomes (wages and employment), followed by single sexual minorities (bisexual and homosexual) then heterosexual single individuals and individuals in different-sex relationships. Although single sexual minorities still face the potential for discrimination and harassment, coupled individuals are less able to conceal their sexual minority status (Fischer et al. 2016) putting them more at risk for discrimination in the workplace. The relationship contexts has the potential to moderate and mediate the association between sexual orientation and labor market outcomes.

Guided by previous research (e.g., Klawitter 2015) I expect that sexual minority men and women will be less likely to be employed than heterosexual men and women. Furthermore, I expect that homosexual men will have lower wages, compared to heterosexual men and that lesbian women will have higher wages, compared to heterosexual women. Based on previous research by Mize (2016) and Carpenter (2005) I expect that bisexual men and women will have the lowest wages. Additionally, it is unclear how union status will complicate the patterns of employment and earnings. I expect single bisexual and homosexual men to be less likely to be employed than men in different-sex marriages and different-sex cohabiting relationships. Similarly, I expect single bisexual and homosexual men to have lower wages than men in different-sex marriages and different-sex cohabiting relationships. Among women, I expect single homosexual women to be more likely to be employed and have higher earnings than women in different-sex marriages and in different-sex cohabiting relationships. I expect single bisexual women to be less likely to be employed and to have lower wages than women in different-sex marriages and different-sex cohabiting relationships.

Previous studies have identified a number of other factors that were related to wages, occupation, and sexual minority status. Based on these findings, the current study controls for age (Mize 2016), race (Gates 2015), parental status (Black et al. 2007), education (Black et al. 2007), student status (Mize 2016), region (Baumle and Poston 2011; Baumle et al. 2009; Mize 2016; Gates 2015), coresidence (Mize 2016; Leppel 2014), occupation (Badgett 1995; Blandford 2003), and hours work (Antecol and Steinberger 2013). I replicate Mize (2016) in my controls but make some refinements such as separating same-sex coresidence from different sex cohabitation and different-sex marriage in addition to examining hours worked (instead of part-time status).

Data and Methods

See Chapter 2 for details on the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health.

Analytic sample. The sample of respondents who completed the first in-home interview (N=20,745) was restricted in several ways. First, I exclude individuals who did not have valid responses to the question on working for pay at Wave IV (n=7,785). Next, I exclude 786 individuals who were missing on survey design variables. Finally, I drop individuals who did not have valid responses on the sexual orientation identity question at Wave IV, as elaborated below (n=124). The final sample for the employment analysis includes 12,119 respondents. Specific samples sizes for each group can be found in the Appendix (see Table A 3.10).

The analyses for wages is based on a subsample of the employment sample. The sample of respondents who were included in the employment analyses (N=12,119) was restricted in several ways. First, I exclude individuals who were not working for pay at least 10 hours per

week (n=2,576). Next, I drop individuals without valid responses for income (n=178). Finally, I exclude 78 respondents without valid occupational codes. The final sample for the wages analysis included 9,287 respondents. Again, specific samples sizes for each group can be found in the Appendix (see Table A 3.11).

Dependent Variables

Employment status. Following previous work using Add Health (Mize 2016), individuals were be coded as employed if they were currently working for pay at least 10 hours a week at the Wave IV interview. In supplemental analyses discussed later, I alternately examine full-time employment (working at least 35 hours per week).

Wages. Following previous work using Add Health by Mize (2016) and Sabia (2014), I examine personal wages, or the amount individuals are compensated per hour they work. Personal wages were operationalized by taking personal income, divided by work hours times fifty. I then use the log of wages to normalize the distribution and minimize the influence of high-earning outliers.

Independent Variables

Sexual orientation identity. Sexual minority status was operationalized using the following question from Wave III: "Please choose the description that best fits how you think about yourself: (1) 100 percent heterosexual (straight), (2) mostly heterosexual (straight), but somewhat attracted to people of your own sex, (3) bisexual that is, attracted to men and women equally, (4) mostly homosexual (gay), but somewhat attracted to people of the opposite sex, (5) 100 percent homosexual (gay), (6) not sexually attracted to either males or females." Following previous research on sexual minorities in the labor market (Mize 2016) I exclude asexual respondents from the analyses and will recode sexual minority status into three categories (1) 100 percent heterosexual (straight)/ mostly heterosexual, but somewhat attracted to people of

your own sex, (2) bisexual that is, attracted to men and women equally, and (3) mostly homosexual (gay), but somewhat attracted to people of the opposite sex and 100 percent homosexual (gay).

Couple types. Based on the relationship roster provided at Wave IV, I determine the sex composition and relationship type of the respondent. Sex composition of the couple was classified as a same-sex coresidential relationship if the respondent's sex (as marked by the interviewer) and the sex of their current partner (marked by the respondent) are the same and if they household roster reports the partner as a marriage partner or cohabiting partner. Respondents were classified as in a different-sex married relationship if the respondent sex and partner sex are different and the partner was reported as a married partner/spouse in the household roster. Respondents were classified as in a different-sex cohabiting relationship if the respondent sex and partner sex are different and the partner was reported as a cohabiting partner in the household roster. Individuals were classified as single if they do not report living with a married partner/spouse/cohabiting partner in the household roster. These individuals were then separated into three categories using the sexual orientation identity question (see above): heterosexual single, bisexual single, and homosexual single. In analyses based on couple type, the 6 relationship types were compared: homosexual single, bisexual single, heterosexual single, same-sex coresidential, different-sex cohabiting, and different-sex married (reference group). Control Variables

Age. I include a variable for respondent's age at Wave IV.

Race. Race of respondent was collected from the first wave of the study and was recoded to a series of dummy variables (non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic other) with non-Hispanic white acting as the reference group.
Education. Education was measured at Wave IV and was recoded into a series of dummy variables (high school diploma or GED, some college education, bachelor's degree, or graduate degree) with no high school degree acting as the reference group.

Student status. I include a variable indicating if the respondent was a student at Wave IV.

Relationship status. In the analysis of sexual orientation identity, I will four indicators for relationship status at Wave IV: different-sex married (reference group), different-sex cohabiting, same-sex coresidential, and not married/cohabiting.

Child in household. I will include a variable indicating if the respondent has a child in the household at Wave IV.

Region. Region was measured at Wave IV and includes four major Census regions of the United States (Midwest, South, and West) with Northeast acting as the reference group.

Hours worked. Deviating from Mize (2016) in analyses of wages, I include a variable that indicates the number of hours the respondent typically works at Wave IV. In supplemental analyses (not shown) I use an indicator for part-time employment, rather than hours worked. Results are the same whether using hours worked as a continuous variable or using the dichotomous indicator of part-time work.

Occupation category. In analyses of wages, I include a variable for occupation from Wave IV. Occupation category includes the 10 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) occupation categories for the United States. These categories include managers (reference group), professionals, technicians, sales, administrative support, craft, operative, laborers, service, and military.

Analytic Strategy

I conducted two sets of analyses. The first examined employment (working at least 10 hours per week) first by identity and then by couple type using logistic regression. Descriptive statistics are provided for the entire sample as well as by identity and couple type. The logistic regression models presented use 100 percent/mostly heterosexual as the reference group for identity and different-sex married as the reference group for couple type. Supplemental analyses (included in the Appendix) switch out the reference groups and use bisexual for identity and homosexual single for couple type. All analyses are broken down by gender.

The second set of analyses uses OLS regression to examine wages among a subsample of individuals who are working at least 10 hours per week. Once again, descriptive statistics are provided for the entire sample and then broken down by identity and couple type. As with employment, 100 percent/mostly heterosexual is used as the reference group for analyses by identity and different-sex married is the reference group for analyses by couple type. Supplemental analyses (included in the Appendix) switch out the reference groups and use bisexual for identity and homosexual single for couple type. All analyses are broken down by gender.

Results

Descriptive results- employment. Table 4.1 presents the weighted means and proportions for employment by sexual orientation identity and gender. I also test for statistical differences between heterosexuals and the other groups (bisexuals and homosexuals). These statistics are first shown for the entire sample (column 1), next for the three samples of men (columns 2, 3, and 4), and then for women (columns 5, 6, and 7). The greatest percent of homosexual men are working at least 10 hours per week (85.9 percent), followed by heterosexual men (84.1 percent),

and bisexual men (82.5 percent). Neither homosexual men nor bisexual men are significantly different from heterosexual men in terms of employment. Among women, the greatest percentage working for pay at least 10 hours per week were homosexual women (78.8 percent), followed by heterosexual women (72.5 percent), and bisexual women (61.5 percent). The difference between bisexual women and heterosexual women is marginally significant.

Consistent with expectations, there are significant differences in union type by identity: 36.4 percent of heterosexual men are in a different-sex married relationship, compared to 17.6 percent of bisexual men and 0.0 percent of homosexual men. I find a similar pattern for differentsex cohabitation with 19.95 percent of heterosexual men, 14.6 percent of bisexual men, and 1.0 percent of homosexual men in a different-sex cohabiting relationship. Over a quarter (25.8 percent) of homosexual men are in a same-sex coresidential relationship, compared to less than 1 percent of heterosexual and bisexual men. Finally, almost three quarters (73.1 percent) of homosexual men are not currently in a coresidential relationship, compared to 67.6 percent of bisexual men and less than half (43.5 percent) of heterosexual men. All differences between heterosexual men and homosexual men are statistically significant. However, only the difference between bisexual and heterosexual men not in a coresidential relationship is statistically significant.

A similar pattern of differences between union types by identity can be seen for women. Over 40 percent (44.6 percent) of heterosexual women are in a different-sex marriage, compared to 20.2 percent of bisexual women and 4.3 percent of homosexual women. The differences between heterosexual women and the other groups in marital status are statistically significant. Next, 19.1 percent of heterosexual women, 24.0 percent of bisexual women, and less than 1 percent of homosexual women were in a different-sex cohabiting relationship. The difference between heterosexual and homosexual women is statistically significant, but the difference between heterosexual and bisexual women is not. Over 40 percent (40.5 percent) of homosexual women were in a same-sex cohabiting relationship, compared to 9.9 percent of bisexual women and 0.01 percent of heterosexual women. The difference between heterosexual women and the other groups are statistically significant. Finally, over half (54.7 percent) of homosexual women were not in a coresidential union, compared to 45.9 percent of bisexual women and 36.3 percent of heterosexual women. The difference between heterosexual women is statistically significant but the difference between heterosexual and homosexual women is

As expected, far less homosexual men and women have children in the household compared to bisexual and heterosexual men and women. Less than 1 percent of homosexual men and 16.99 percent of homosexual women have a child in the household compared to 23.2 percent of bisexual men, 35.7 percent of heterosexual men, 55.1 percent of bisexual women, and 59.4 percent of heterosexual women. The difference between heterosexual men and homosexual men as well as the difference between heterosexual women and homosexual women with children is statistically significant. However, the difference between heterosexual men and women and bisexual men and women is not statistically significant.

The results of statistics tests for the other variables suggest an overwhelming similarity between the three groups, at least within men and women. However, a few statistically significant differences between groups do exist. Homosexual women are more likely to currently be a student (31.4 percent) than heterosexual women (18.7 percent). Bisexual men are more likely to have less than a high school education (24.6 percent) than heterosexual men while homosexual men are more likely to have a graduate degree (13.6 percent) than heterosexual men. Bisexual women are more likely to have less than a high school degree (17.9 percent) and less likely to have a college degree (13.4 percent) than heterosexual women (7.7 percent and 23.55 percent, respectively). Homosexual women are more likely to live in the Midwest (32 percent) and South (39.6 percent) than heterosexual women (31.96 percent and 38.1 percent, respectively). Bisexual men are more likely to live in the Midwest (52.9 percent) and South (23.2 percent) than heterosexual men (31.1 percent and 39.4 percent, respectively). Homosexual men are more likely to be Hispanic (20.1 percent) than heterosexual men (11.54 percent). Finally, bisexual women are significantly younger (27.8) than heterosexual women (28.3).

Table 4.2 displays the descriptive statistics for employment (working 10 hours per week) by couple type for men. The vast majority of men in different-sex married relationships (90.8 percent) are working for pay at least 10 hours per week. Bisexual single (86.8 percent) and homosexual single (85.5 percent) have the next highest percentage working for pay at least 10 hours per week, followed by mem in different-sex cohabiting relationships (84.9 percent), men in same-sex coresidential relationships (78.96 percent) and finally heterosexual single men (78.3 percent). Men in different-sex cohabiting relationships and heterosexual single men are significantly different from men in different-sex marriages. The difference between men in different-sex marriages and those in same-sex coresidential unions, bisexual single men, and homosexual single men are not statistically significant.

Once again, as expected, there are significant differences in having a child in the household by union type. Almost 70 percent (69.6 percent) of men in different-sex married relationships had a child in the household, compared to 39.5 percent of men in different-sex cohabiting unions, 8.4 percent of men in same-sex coresidential relationships, 5.8 percent of single heterosexual men, 2.1 percent of bisexual single men, and 0 percent of homosexual single men. All groups of men are significantly different from men in different-sex marriages.

Several statistically significant differences between men in different-sex marriages and the other groups do exist. First, men in different-sex cohabiting (28.3) and heterosexual single men (28.3) are significantly younger than men in different-sex marriages (28.9). Next, there are some significant differences by educational attainment. Men in different-sex cohabiting unions are more likely to have less than a high school degree (15.8 percent) while homosexual single men are less likely to have less than a high school degree (2.8 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (9.2 percent). Men in different-sex cohabiting relationships (23.1 percent) and heterosexual single men (23.6 percent) are more likely to have a high school degree than men in different-sex marriages (17.3 percent). Heterosexual single men are less likely to have some college (38.9 percent) than men in different-sex marriages. Over 40 percent (41.4 percent) of men in same-sex coresidential unions have a college degree, compared to only 20.9 percent of men in different-sex marriages and almost 15 percent (14.98 percent) of homosexual single men have a graduate degree compared to only 6.3 percent of men in different-sex marriages.

In addition, there are difference by region. Bisexual single men are less likely to live in the Northeast (4.5 percent) and South (25.98 percent) and more likely to live in the Midwest (62.5 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (15.6 percent, 43.2 percent, and 31.0 percent, respectively). Men in different-sex cohabiting unions (16.2 percent) and men in same-sex coresidential unions (28.5 percent) are more likely to live in the West than men in different-sex marriages (10.2 percent). There are also significant differences in group by race. Almost three quarters (74 percent) of men in different-sex marriages are white compared to only 55.4 percent of homosexual single men. Heterosexual single men (19.4 percent), bisexual single men (21.1 percent), and men in different-sex cohabiting relationships (18 percent) are more likely to be

black than men in different-sex marriages (9.84 percent). Finally, 15.3 percent of heterosexual single men are currently students compared to 11.1 percent of men in different-sex marriages.

Table 4.3 displays the descriptive statistics for employment by couple type for women. Women in same-sex coresidential relationships have the highest percentage working for pay at least 10 hours per week (79.3 percent). This is followed by homosexual single women (78.8 percent), heterosexual single women (76.6 percent), women in different-sex cohabiting relationships (75.3), women in different-sex married relationships (67.8 percent) and only 50.8 percent of bisexual women. Women in different-sex cohabiting relationships, heterosexual single women, and bisexual single women are significantly different from women in different-sex marriages on employment. Homosexual single women and women in same-sex coresidential unions are not significantly different from women in different-sex marriages when it comes to employment.

As with men, numerous statistically significant differences between women in differentsex marriages and the other groups of women exist. First, 74.6 percent of women in different-sex marriages have children in the household compared to 53.99 percent of women in different-sex cohabiting unions, 12.3 percent of women in same-sex coresidential unions, 43.4 percent of heterosexual single women, and 16.9 percent of homosexual single women. Women in differentsex cohabiting unions (27.9), same-sex coresidential unions (27.8) and bisexual singles (27.2) are all significantly younger than women in different-sex marriages (28.6). Next, there are several significant differences by educational attainment. First, heterosexual single women are more likely to have less than a high school degree (8.5 percent) compared to women in different-sex marriages (5.7 percent). Women in different-sex cohabiting relationships are more likely to have a high school degree (16.1 percent) than women in different-sex marriages (14.9 percent). Women in same-sex coresidential unions are more likely to have some college (63.8 percent) than women in different-sex marriages (43.2 percent). Women in different-sex cohabiting unions (19.4 percent) and single bisexual women (9.1 percent) are less likely to have a college degree than women in different-sex marriages (26.3 percent). Almost 10 percent (9.95 percent) of women in different-sex marriages have a graduate degree compared to only 4.8 percent of women in different-sex cohabiting unions, 2.8 percent of bisexual single women, and 1.5 percent of women in same-sex coresidential unions.

The only significant difference by region is between women in different-sex marriages and different-sex cohabiting unions. Women in different-sex cohabiting unions are less likely to live in the South (30.4 percent) compared to women in different-sex marriages (39.88 percent). There are several significant differences by race. Heterosexual single (56.8 percent) and bisexual single (51.5 percent) women are less likely to be white than women in different-sex marriages (77.9 percent). Approximately 8 percent (7.7 percent) of women in different-sex marriages are black compared to 15.1 percent of women in different-sex cohabiting relationships, 18.1 percent of women in same-sex coresidential relationships, 26.7 percent of heterosexual single women, and 23.6 percent of bisexual single women. Women in same-sex coresidential unions are less likely to be of other races (0.5 percent) compared to women in different-sex marriages. Finally, heterosexual single women (24.2 percent) and homosexual single women (32.2 percent) are more likely to currently be a student than women in different-sex marriages (15 percent).

Multivariate results- employment. Moving to results that take into account the ways in which these groups differ, Table 4.4 presents odds ratios from logistic regression models predicting employment (working 10 hours per week) stratified by gender. Columns 1 and 3 show the zero-order models between each of the variables and employment. As can be seen in the

table, there is no significant difference in odds of employment by sexual orientation identity among men. Among women, bisexuals have significantly lower odds of being employed compared to heterosexuals. However, homosexual women do not differ significantly from heterosexual women on employment at the zero-order level. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.1) heterosexual men and homosexual men do not differ significantly from bisexual men in the zero-order model. Heterosexual women and homosexual women both have higher odds of employment than bisexual women in the zero-order model.

Considering the effects of control variables, education, race, student status, and having a child in the household, and union type are all significantly associated with employment among men at the zero-order level. Men with higher levels of education have higher odds of being employed. Black men have lower odds of being employed than non-Hispanic white men. Men who are currently students have lower odds of being employed and men with children in the household have higher odds of being employed. Finally, all union types (different-sex cohabiting, same-sex coresidential, and not married or cohabiting) have significantly lower odds of employment than different-sex married among men.

For women, the control variables of education, race, children in the household, and union type are all significantly associated with employment (working 10 hours per week). More specifically, women with higher levels of education have higher odds of being employed. Hispanic women have higher odds of being employed than white women and women with children in the household have lower odds of being employed. Furthermore, all union types (different-sex cohabiting, same-sex coresidential, and not married or cohabiting) have significantly higher odds of employment than different-sex married among women. Column 2 of Table 4.4 reports the results once all covariates are added to the model for men. In the full model, bisexual men and homosexual men are still not significantly different from heterosexual men. This does not support the hypothesis that sexual minority men would have lower odds of employment than heterosexual men. In the full model, education, race, and student status remain significantly related to odds of employment for men. The difference between different-sex married and same-sex coresidential union status also remains significant once included in the full model. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A.4.1.) heterosexual men and homosexual men do not differ significantly from bisexual men in full model.

Column 4 of Table 4.4 reports the results once all covariates are added to the model for women. Bisexual women still have significantly lower odds of being employed compared to heterosexual women, even after including all controls in the model. However, homosexual women are not significantly different from heterosexual women in terms of employment. This finding partially supports the hypothesis that sexual minority women would have lower odds of employment than heterosexual women. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.1) only heterosexual women have significantly higher odds of being employed than bisexual women in the full model. Education and race are positively associated with employment among women, while being and student and having a child in the household are negatively associated with employment (working 10 hours per week). Unlike with men, the difference between different-sex married and same-sex coresidential union status is no longer significant once included in the full model. In analyses not shown, the difference between different-sex married and same-sex coresidential union status is no longer significant once the identity variables included.

Table 4.5 displays the results of logistic regression models of employment (working 10 hours per week) by couple type. Column 1 displays the zero-order results for men. When looking specifically at union type, men in different-sex cohabiting relationships, heterosexuals not in coresidential unions, and men in same-sex coresidential unions have significant lower odds of being employed than men in different-sex married unions. Interestingly, bisexual men and homosexual men not in coresidential unions do not significantly differ from men in different-sex married relationships when it comes to employment. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.2.) heterosexual single men have significantly lower odds of being employed than homosexual single men in the zero-order model. However, none of the other groups differ significantly from homosexual single men on employment in the zero-order model. After adding in the control variables (Column 2), men in different-sex cohabiting, same-sex cohabiting, and heterosexual not in coresidential unions all continue to have significantly lower odds of employment than men in different-sex married relationships. Bisexual and homosexual men not in coresidential relationships remain not significantly different from men in differentsex married relationships, even after adding all of the control variables. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.2.) none of the groups of men differ significantly from homosexual single men on employment. These findings indicate that the context of the relationship is more important to employment, than sexual orientation identity on its own.

Column 3 of Table 4.5 displays the zero-order results for women. Women in differentsex cohabiting, same-sex coresidential, and heterosexuals not in coresidential unions have significantly higher odds of being employed than women in different-sex married unions. In contrast, bisexual women not in a coresidential union have significantly lower odds of being employed compared to women in different-sex married unions. However, homosexual women not in a coresidential union do not differ from women in different-sex married unions when it comes to employment. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.2.) bisexual single women have significantly lower odds of being employed than homosexual single women in the zero-order model. However, none of the other groups of women differ significantly from homosexual single women on employment in the zero-order model. Column 4 of Table 4.5 shows the full model for women. After including the control variables, women in different-sex cohabiting relationships and heterosexuals not in coresidential unions continue to have significantly higher odds of employment than women in different-sex married relationships. Bisexual women not in coresidential unions continue to have significantly lower odds of employment compared to different-sex married women. However, women in same-sex coresidential unions are no longer significantly different from different-sex married women in terms of employment once the control variables are added. In analyses not shown, the difference between different-sex married and same-sex coresidential union status is no longer significant once children are included in the model. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.2.) bisexual single women continue to have significantly lower odds of being employed than homosexual single women in the full model. However, none of the other groups of women differ significantly from homosexual single women on employment in the full model.

Descriptive results – wages. Table 4.6 displays the weighted means and proportions for the wages analyses, by sexual orientation identity and gender. These statistics are first shown for the entire sample (column 1), next for the three samples of men (columns 2, 3, and 4), and then for women (columns 5, 6, and 7). Once again, the wages sample is a subset of respondents included in the previous analysis. Heterosexual men have the highest wages (19.262) followed by homosexual men (18.442), and bisexual men (12.250). Bisexual men have significantly lower

wages than heterosexual men, but homosexual men are not significantly different from heterosexual men on wages. Among women, heterosexuals have the highest wages (16.448), followed by homosexuals (15.059), and bisexuals (12.305). Bisexual women have significantly lower wages than heterosexual women, but homosexual women are not significantly different from heterosexual women on wages.

As expected, there are significant differences in union type by identity. Among men, 39.70 percent of heterosexuals are in a different-sex married union, compared to 13.18 percent of bisexuals, and 0 percent of homosexuals. The difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals is statistically significant. Just over 20 percent of heterosexual men are in a different-sex cohabiting relationship compared to 15.51 percent of bisexuals and 1.23 percent of homosexuals. The difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals is statistically significant. Not surprisingly, 23.30 percent of homosexual men are in a same-sex coresidential relationship compared to 0.05 percent of heterosexual men and 0.00 percent of bisexual men. The difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals is statistically significant. Finally, over three quarters (75.47 percent) of homosexual men are not currently in a coresidential relationship, compared to 70.68 percent of bisexual men and 40.06 percent of heterosexual men. The difference between heterosexuals and homosexuals, as well as heterosexuals and bisexuals, is statistically significant.

Similarly, there are significant differences in union type by identity among women. Consistent with expectations, 42.54 percent of heterosexual women are in a different-sex married relationship, compared to only 18.40 percent of bisexual women and 3.16 percent of homosexual women. The difference between heterosexuals and homosexuals, as well as heterosexuals and bisexuals, is statistically significant. Less than 1 percent (0.27 percent) of homosexual women are in a different-sex cohabiting union, compared to 31.1 percent of bisexual women, and 19.7 percent of heterosexual women. The difference between heterosexuals and homosexuals, as well as heterosexuals and bisexuals, is statistically significant. Not surprisingly, 42.50 percent of homosexual women are in a same-sex coresidential union compared to 12.30 percent of bisexual women and 0.00 percent of heterosexual women. The difference between heterosexuals and homosexuals, as well as heterosexuals and bisexuals, is statistically significant. Finally, the majority (54.06 percent) of homosexual women are not currently in a coresidential union, compared to 38.16 percent of bisexual women and 30.13 percent of heterosexual women. The difference between heterosexual women.

Consistent with the employment sample, the results of statistics tests for the other variables suggest an overwhelming similarity between the three groups, at least within men and women. However, several significant differences do exist. First, homosexual men are less likely to have less than a high school degree (3 percent) and more likely to have a graduate degree (14.6 percent) compared to heterosexual men (9.5 percent and 5.8 percent, respectively). Regionally, bisexual men are more likely to reside in the Midwest (61.8 percent) and less likely to reside in the South (19.2 percent) than heterosexual men (31.2 percent and 39.2 percent, respectively). Homosexual men are significantly less likely to have a child in the household (0.47 percent) compared to heterosexual men (37.9 percent). Finally, in terms of occupation, homosexual men are over represented in the manager (20.4 percent), professional (51 percent), and laborer (5.5 percent) categories and underrepresented in the craft category (0.1 percent) compared to heterosexual men (7.5 percent, 21.9 percent, 8.3 percent, and 19.1 percent, respectively). Finally, 3.1 percent of bisexual men had occupations in the military category, compared to less than 1 percent (0.2 percent) of heterosexual men.

Turning to women, there are several statistically significant differences between heterosexuals and the other groups in terms of education, children in the household, and occupational categories. First, homosexual women have the smallest percentage (0. 8 percent) without a high school degree, but the highest percent with just a high school degree (19.6 percent). Not surprisingly, only 11.8 percent of homosexual women have a child in the household compared to 53.2 percent of heterosexual women. Finally, homosexual women are overrepresented in sales occupations (21.5 percent) and underrepresented in service occupations (15.1 percent) compared to heterosexual women (9.5 percent and 25.9 percent, respectively). While bisexual women are underrepresented in technician occupations (0.8 percent) and overrepresented in service occupations (38.6 percent) compared to heterosexual women (5.9 percent and 25.9 percent, respectively).

Table 4.7 displays the descriptive statistics for wages by couple type for men. Men in same-sex coresidential unions have the highest hourly wages (27.197), followed by men in different-sex married relationships (21.966), homosexual single men (17.320), men in different-sex cohabiting relationships (17.504), heterosexual men (17.354), and finally bisexual men have the lowest wages (11.338). Men in different-sex cohabiting unions, heterosexual single men, bisexual single men, and homosexual single men have significantly lower wages than men in different-sex marriages. Men in same-sex cohabiting relationships do not differ significantly from men in different-sex marriages on wages.

As with the employment sample, numerous statistically significant differences exist between men in different-sex marriages and the other groups of men. First, men in different-sex cohabiting relationships (28.3) and heterosexual single men (28.3) are significantly younger than men in different-sex marriages (28.9). Next, several difference exist in educational attainment. Men in different-sex cohabiting relationships are more likely to have less than a high school degree (13.2 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (8.6 percent). Heterosexual single men are more likely to have a high school degree (22.4 percent) and less likely to have some college education (39.9 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (17 percent and 45.9 percent, respectively). Homosexual single men are more likely to have a graduate degree (15.9 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (9.96 percent). In addition, there are regional differences. Only 5 percent of bisexual men live in the Northeast, compared to 15.8 percent of men in different-sex marriages. Almost 70 percent (69.3 percent) of bisexual single men, and 15.99 percent of men in same-sex coresidential unions live in the Midwest, compared to 30.8 percent of men in different-sex marriages. Approximately 17 percent (17.4 percent) of bisexual single men and 30.5 percent of men in different-sex cohabiting unions live in the South compared to 43.4 percent of men in different-sex marriages. Less than 10 percent (9.96 percent) of men in different-sex marriages live in the West, compared to 17.7 percent of men in different-sex cohabiting relationships and 31.9 percent of men in same-sex coresidential relationships.

When it comes to race, almost three quarters (74.3 percent) of men in different-sex marriages are white, compared to 63.5 percent of heterosexual single men and 53.8 percent of homosexual single men. In addition, homosexual single men are more likely to be another race (10.4 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (3.96 percent). Heterosexual single men (13.11 percent) are more likely to currently be a student and bisexual single men (0.81 percent) are less likely to currently be a student than men in different-sex marriages (9.4 percent). As expected men in different-sex marriages are more likely to have children in the home than any other group of men. More specifically, 70.1 percent of men in different-sex marriages have children in the home, compared to 38.8 percent of men in different-sex cohabiting relationships,

7.1 percent of men in same-sex coresidential relationships, 5.7 percent of heterosexual single men, 2.5 percent of bisexual single men, and 0.1 percent of homosexual single men.

Men also differ on occupational characteristics. Men in different-sex cohabiting relationships (43.5) and heterosexual single men (43.3) work significantly fewer hours than men in different-sex marriages (46.2). Homosexual single men are more likely to be managers (21.5 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (8.7 percent). Homosexual single men (48.3 percent) and men in same-sex coresidential unions (57.9 percent) are more likely to be professionals while men in different-sex cohabiting unions (15.1 percent) and bisexual single men (3.5 percent) are less likely to be professionals than men in different-sex marriages (24.4 percent). Homosexual single men are more likely to be in administrative support (9.8 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (2.1 percent). Heterosexual single men (14.95 percent) and homosexual single men (0.09 percent) are less likely to be in craft professions than men in different-sex marriages (22.5 percent). Men in same-sex coresidential unions are less likely to be in operatives occupations (1.2 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (13.99 percent). Homosexual single men are less likely to be laborers (0.07 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (11.2 percent). Bisexual single men (34.2 percent), heterosexual single men (18.95 percent), and men in different-sex cohabiting relationships (18.3 percent) are more likely to be in service occupations than men in different-sex marriages (11.2 percent). Finally, bisexual single men are more likely to be in military occupations (4.5 percent) than men in different-sex marriages (0.15 percent).

Table 4.8 presents the descriptive statistics for wages by couple type for women. Women in different-sex married relationships have the highest hourly wages (17.351), followed by homosexual single women (16.509), women in different-sex cohabiting relationships (15.906),

heterosexual single women (15.567), women in same-sex coresidential unions (15.019), and bisexual single women(11.066). Heterosexual single women and bisexual single women are significantly different from women in different-sex marriages on wages. However, women in different-sex cohabiting unions, women in same-sex coresidential unions, and homosexual single women are not significantly different from women in different-sex marriages on wages.

Once again, as with the employment sample, numerous statistically significant differences exist between women in different-sex marriages and the other groups of women. First, women in different-sex cohabiting unions (27.99) and heterosexual single women (28.1) are significantly younger than women in different-sex marriages (28.6). Next, there are educational differences. Women in different-sex cohabiting unions (52 percent), women in samesex coresidential unions (65.8 percent), and heterosexual single women (49.3 percent) are more likely to have some college education than women in different-sex marriages (42.2 percent). Women in different-sex cohabiting unions (23.4 percent) and bisexual single women (11.1 percent) are less likely to have a college degree than women in different-sex marriages (30.4 percent). In addition, women in different-sex cohabiting unions (5.21 percent) and women in same-sex coresidential unions (1.2 percent) are less likely to have a graduate degree than women in different-sex marriages (11.3 percent). Regionally, women in different-sex cohabiting relationships are less likely to live in the South (28.4 percent) than women in different-sex marriages (37.8 percent).

Racially, there are several differences between groups. Over 75 percent (76.8 percent) of women in different-sex marriages are white, compared to 57.5 percent of heterosexual single women and 47.5 bisexual single women. In addition, 8.9 percent of women in different-sex marriages are black, compared to 24.5 percent of heterosexual single women and 30.9 percent of

bisexual women. Only 2.96 percent of women in different-sex marriages are of another race, compared to 14.3 percent of bisexual single women. Heterosexual single women are more likely to currently be a student (23.4 percent) than women in different-sex marriages (14.7 percent). As expected women in different-sex marriages are more likely to have children in the home than any other group of women. More specifically, 67.4 percent of women in different-sex marriages have children in the home, compared to 50.1 percent of women in different-sex cohabiting relationships, 6.8 percent of women in same-sex coresidential relationships, 38.97 percent of heterosexual single women, 47.9 percent of bisexual single women, and 11.4 percent of homosexual single women.

Finally, there are several differences between the groups of women on occupational category. Less than 1 percent (0.7 percent) of bisexual single women are managers, compared to 7.6 percent of women in different-sex marriages. Women in different-sex cohabiting relationships (26.1 percent) and women in same-sex coresidential unions (11.95 percent) are less likely to be professionals than women in different-sex marriages (34.7 percent). Women in same-sex coresidential unions (28.8 percent) are more likely to be in sales than women in different-sex marriages (9.5 percent). Almost 10 percent (9.8 percent) of homosexual single women are laborers compared to 1.2 percent of women in different-sex marriages. Bisexual single women (46.3 percent) and heterosexual single women (27.8 percent) are more likely to be in service occupations than women in different-sex marriages (22.5 percent).

Multivariate results – wages. Table 4.9 presents the OLS regression models predicting log hourly wages among employed individuals. Columns 1 and 3 display the zero-order model for men and women respectively. Compared to heterosexuals, both bisexual men and women have significantly lower wages. However, compared to heterosexuals, both homosexual men and

women do not have significantly different wages. These findings are consistent with Mize (2016) and support the hypothesis that bisexual men and women will have lower wages than heterosexual men and women. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.8.) homosexual men and heterosexual men have higher wages than bisexual men in the zeroorder model. In addition, heterosexual women and homosexual women have significantly higher wages than bisexual women in the zero-order model.

Several of the control variables are significantly associated with log wages at the zeroorder level. Both men and women with higher levels of education have higher wages. Men and women living in the South have significantly lower wages than men and women living in the Northeast. Men with a child in the household have higher wages while women with children in the household have lower wages. Non-Hispanic black men and Hispanic men, have significantly lower wages and men of other races have significantly lower wages than non-Hispanic white men. Non-Hispanic black women have significantly lower wages while women of other races have significantly higher wages than non-Hispanic white women. Men and women in sales, administrative support, craft, operatives, laborers service and service occupations have significantly lower wages than men and women in manager occupations. Similarly, men and women in military occupations have significantly higher wages than men and women in manager occupations. Finally, men and women in different-sex cohabiting relationships and men and women not in a coresidential relationship have significantly lower wages than men and women in different-sex married relationships.

Columns 2 and 4 display the full models for men and women respectively. The addition of controls to the model reduces the difference between bisexuals and heterosexuals to marginally significant for both men and women. Additional analyses (not shown) reveal that the

addition of union type to the model is what reduces the differences between bisexuals and heterosexuals out of significance. Importantly, when replicating the union type variables (marriage and cohabitation) used by Mize (2016), bisexuals continue to have significantly lower wages than heterosexuals (not shown). In the full model, for men, education, race, occupational category, and union type remain significantly associated with wages. For women, education, region, race, children in the household, occupational category, and union type remain significantly associated with wages. These findings do not support the hypothesis that sexual minority men and women will have lower wages than heterosexual men and women. When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.8.) heterosexual men have significantly higher wages than bisexual men and heterosexual women have significantly higher wages than bisexual women in the full-order model. However, homosexual men and homosexual women do not differ from bisexual men and women on wages in the full-model.

Table 4.10 displays OLS regressions predicting log wages by couple type. Column 1 displays the zero-order model for men. When looking at couple type men in different-sex cohabiting unions, heterosexual men not in coresidential unions, bisexual men not in coresidential unions, and homosexual men not in coresidential unions all have significantly lower wages than men in different-sex married unions. However, men in same-sex coresidential unions do not significantly differ from men in different-sex married unions on hourly wages. Even after adding the control variables in column 2, the association between couple type and wages remains the same. Men in different-sex cohabiting unions, heterosexual men not in coresidential unions, bisexual men not in coresidential unions, and homosexual men not in coresidential unions all have significantly lower wages than men in different-sex married unions. These findings underscore the importance of relationship context. Single individuals of all sexual orientation identities, as well as individuals in different-sex relationships have significantly lower wages than men in different-sex married relationships. However, men in same-sex coresidential relationships are not different from men in different-sex married relationships. This extends beyond Mize (2016) who did not find significant differences between heterosexual men, bisexual men, and gay men on wages when only looking at identity.

Column 3 of Table 4.10 displays the zero-order relationship for women. At the zero-order level, women in different-sex cohabiting relationships, heterosexual not in coresidential unions, and bisexuals not in coresidential unions have significantly lower wages than women in different-sex married unions. However, women in same-sex coresidential unions and homosexual women not in a coresidential union do not differ significantly from women in different-sex married relationships in terms of wages. After adding control variables in column 4, women in different-sex cohabiting relationships are no longer significantly different from women in different-sex married relationships. In addition, bisexual women not in coresidential relationships drop to marginal significance difference from women in different-sex married unions. In analyses not shown, the difference between different-sex married and bisexual single women drops to marginal significance once education is included in the model. These findings underscore the importance of relationship context. Women in coresidential relationships do not differ from women in different-sex married relationships in terms of wages.

When switching out the reference group (see Appendix Table A4.9.), in the zero-order model, men in different-sex marriages and men in same-sex coresidential unions have higher hourly wages than homosexual single men while bisexual single men have significantly lower hourly wages than homosexual single men. After adding the control variables, only men in different-sex marriages continue to be significantly different from homosexual single men. Among women, when switching out the reference group, bisexual single women have significantly lower wages than homosexual single women in the zero-order model. None of the other groups of women differ from homosexual single women. In the full model, no groups significantly differ from homosexual single women on wages.

Supplemental analyses. I also conducted several supplemental analyses that are not presented in this chapter. First, I ran parallel analyses that examine full-time employment (rather than just working at least 10 hours per week) as the dependent variable. Bisexual men have significantly lower odds of being employed full-time than heterosexual or homosexual men. This is consistent with previous research by Charlton et al. (2016) who found bisexuals were significantly more likely to be unemployed, but gay men were not significantly different from heterosexuals when it came to employment. Furthermore, men in all relationship types have lower odds of being employed full-time than men in different-sex marriages. Among women, bisexual women have lower odds of being employed full-time than heterosexual women. Furthermore, women in different-sex cohabiting relationships have higher odds of being employed full-time than women in different-sex relationships, while bisexual women not in a coresidential relationship have lower odds of being employed full-time. These tables are included in the Appendix.

Figures 4.1 through 4.6 display the predicted values for employment and wages. More specifically, Figure 4.1 displays the predicted values for employment of men using the means for married men in the employment sample and estimates from Model 1 for men from Table 4.5. Figure 4.2 displays the predicted values for employment of women using the means for married women in the employment sample and estimates from Model 1 for women from Table 4.5.

Figure 4.3 displays the predicted values for full time employment of men using the means for married men in the employment sample and estimates from Model 1 for men from Table A4.5. Figure 4.4 displays the predicted values for full time employment of women using the means for married women in the employment sample and estimates from Model 1 for women from Table A4.5. Figure 4.5 displays the predicted values for wages of men using the means for married men in the wages sample and estimates from the Model 1 for men in Table 4.10. Figure 4.6 displays the predicted values for wages of women using the means for married women in the wages for wages of women using the means for married men in the values for wages of women using the means for married women in the wages sample and estimates from Model 1 for men in Table 4.10. Figure 4.6 displays the predicted values for wages of women using the means for married women in the wages sample and estimates from Model 1 for women in Table 4.10. For each of the estimates I change the values for the focal categories.

As can be seen in Figure 4.1, all groups of men have lower odds of employment than married men even if they had the mean values of married men. Men in same-sex coresidential unions have the lowest odds of being employed if all groups had the mean values of married men. Figure 4.2 displays the predicted values of employment for women if couple types had the mean values of women in different-sex marriages. As can be seen in the figure, single bisexual women have odds that are much lower than women in different-sex marriages. Figures 4.3 and 4.4 shoe the predicted values for full-time employment. The patterns are nearly identical with one exception. While all groups of men still have lower odds of being employed full-time than single heterosexual and single homosexual men. Figure 4.5 displays the predicted values of wages of men in all couple types had the mean values of men in different-sex marriages. Different-sex married men and men in same-sex coresidential unions have almost identical wages. All other groups of men have lower wages. Figure 4.6 displays the predicted values of wages of women in all couple types if they had the mean values of women in different-

sex marriages. All groups of women look remarkably similar to women in different-sex marriages. Single bisexual women have slightly lower wages than the other groups.

Discussion

Despite achieving marriage equality in 2015, there is still no federal law protecting sexual minorities from employment discrimination. Given the importance of labor market participation to outcomes such as household division of labor (Nordenmark 2017) and health disparities (McLeod 2015) it is important to develop a better understanding of the implications of sexual orientation identity, as well as relationship type, on labor market outcomes. Using data from Wave IV of Add Health, this study investigated how sexual orientation identity and relationship type were associated with employment and wages, as well as whether the influence of sexual orientation identity and relationship type varies within gender.

First, when examining employment for men, I find no differences by identity in terms of odds of being employed in the full model. When I expand the measure to include relationship context, men in different-sex cohabiting, same-sex cohabiting, and heterosexual men not in a coresidential relationship have significantly lower odds of being employed than men in different-sex married relationship. However, bisexual men not in a coresidential relationship and homosexual men not in a coresidential relationship fail to differ from men in different-sex marriages in terms of employment. These findings are inconsistent with previous research by Charlton et al. (2016) who found bisexuals were significantly more likely to be unemployed, but gay men were not significantly different from heterosexuals when it came to employment. However, these findings are consistent with the minority stress and ecological systems theory perspective which suggest that individuals in a same-sex relationship would be more at risk for

worse outcomes than single sexual minorities. These findings do not support the hypothesis that sexual minority men will be less likely to be employed than heterosexual men.

Next, examining wages for men, looking just at identity, bisexual men have lower wages than heterosexual and homosexual men. Consistent with previous research by Carpenter (2005) and Mize (2016) it appears that the wage penalty often found for sexual minority men is actually being driven by men who identity as bisexual. However, once I take into account relationship context, men in different-sex cohabiting relationships as well as heterosexual, bisexual, and gay men not in coresidential relationships have lower wages than men in different-sex married men. Importantly, men in same-sex coresidential unions do not differ on wages from men in differentsex married relationships. These findings underscore the importance of relationship context, especially for men. It appears that the bisexual effect often found for men is largely driven by union status. These findings partially support the hypothesis that bisexual men will have the lowest wages and that homosexual men will have lower wages than heterosexual men.

Among women, I find that bisexual women have significantly lower odds of being employed than heterosexual or homosexual women. After taking into account relationship context, women in different-sex cohabiting relationships and heterosexual women not in a coresidential relationship have higher odds of being employed than women in different-sex married relationship. Women in same-sex coresidential unions and homosexual single women do not differ from women in different-sex marriages when it comes to employment. However, bisexual women not in a coresidential relationship continue to have lower odds of employment than women in different-sex marriages. Once again, these findings are consistent with previous research by Charlton et al. (2016) which found that bisexuals were significantly more likely to be unemployed than heterosexuals, but lesbians were not significantly different from heterosexuals. These findings are not consistent with the minority stress and ecological systems theory perspective which suggest that individuals in a same-sex relationship would be more at risk for worse outcomes than single sexual minorities. These findings partially support the hypothesis that sexual minority women would have lower odds of employment than heterosexual women.

Similar to men, when examining wages for women, just taking into account identity, bisexual women have lower wages than heterosexual women. However, lesbian women do not have significantly different wages than heterosexual women. This is inconsistent with previous research that has noted a wage premium for lesbian women (Berg and Lien 2002; Black et al. 2003; Blanford 2003; Cain and Leppel 2001; Klawitter 2015). Examining wages by relationship type I find that only heterosexual and bisexual women not in a coresidential relationship have lower wages than women in different-sex married relationships. Once again, there is no evidence of a wage premium for women in same-sex relationships or homosexual women not in a coresidential relationship. One possible reason for a lack of wage premium for lesbian women, or women in same-sex couples, in this sample may be the limited age range. Respondents at Wave IV are between 24 and 32 years old. Previous research which has found a wage premium for lesbian women examines individuals 18 years and older (Berg and Lien 2002; Black et al. 2003; Blanford 2003; Cain and Leppel 2001; Klawitter 2015). Importantly, previous research examining wages with Add Health also has not found a wage premium for lesbian women (Mize 2016). These findings do not support the hypothesis that lesbian women would have higher wages than heterosexual women and partially supports the hypothesis that bisexual women would have the lowest wages.

The results of my analyses have important implications for research and policy related to labor market outcomes of sexual minorities. First, limited research has been conducted on employment of sexual minorities in general (Charlton et al. 2016; Sabia 2014). My research takes an important step back to see if inequalities faced by sexual minorities in the labor market begin prior to wages. Sexual minorities, specifically bisexual men and women, have lower odds of being employed. Furthermore, we know that bisexual individuals tend to have worse mental and physical health outcomes than their heterosexual and homosexual counterparts (see Ross et al. 2018). It is important to further examine how employment plays into this picture.

Next, previous research on sexual minorities in the labor force has largely been limited to operationalizing sexual minority status on the basis of coresidence alone (Allegretto and Arthur 2001; Cain and Leppel 2001; Klawitter and Flatt 1998; Baumle and Poston 2011) or, to a lesser extent, identity (Carpenter 2005; Mize 2016; Sabia 2014). My research serves as an important bridge between these two bodies of work by combining both coresidential status and identity. The selection of reference group is also important. When using different-sex married as the reference group all groups of men, except for men in same-sex coresidential relationships, and appear worse off. Among women, only heterosexual and bisexual women appear worse off (in terms of hourly wages) when compared to women in different-sex marriages.

Conventional wisdom regarding sexual minorities in the labor market has noted a wage penalty for gay men (Berg and Lien 2002; Black et al. 2003; Blanford 2003; Cain and Leppel 2001; Klawitter 2015; Poston and Rollman-Tinajero 2018) and bisexual men and women (Carpenter 2005; Mize 2016) and a wage premium for lesbian women (Berg and Lien 2002; Black et al. 2003; Blanford 2003; Cain and Leppel 2001; Klawitter 2015; Poston and Rollman-Tinajero 2018). Furthermore, the most recent analyses of wages focusing on sexual minorities using Add Health data (Mize 2016) concludes that bisexual men and women face wage penalties that are not explained by human capital or occupational characteristics. However, moving beyond strictly measures of identity or coresidence complicates this picture. By combining these two I highlight how it the identity and the context of relationships that are important when examining labor market outcomes. Importantly, the bisexual effect found in previous work (Mize 2016) seems to be driven by union status, not identity.

While this study provides new insights into sexual minorities and labor market outcomes, there are a few important limitations. First, the basic measure of employment is quite broad and simply asks if the respondent has worked for pay at least 10 hours a week. Next, at Wave IV individuals are in their late 20s, thus they may not be firmly established in their careers yet. It is possible that the wage premium for sexual minority women and wage penalty for sexual minority men are more the result of cumulative advantage or disadvantage over the life course. Third, it is possible that work context plays a role in wages for sexual minorities. However, Add Health only contains limited questions about the specific work context, such as freedom to make decisions and repetition of work.

Despite these limitations, this study still possesses many strengths. First, this study examines a cohort of young adults. Unlike previous research which combines multiple cohorts, this study allows for a closer look at how labor market outcomes are related to sexual minority status specifically in young adulthood. Next, this research is not restricted to couples. As stated above half of all sexual minority individuals are single (Jones 2016). The current study takes an important step in examining how both identity and relationship context are related to labor market outcomes, with a specific focus on sexual minorities. Given these finding policies should focus not only on supportive work environments for sexual minorities, but also on active recruitment and retention of sexual minorities. Future research should extend this line of scholarship by examining how the intersection of identity and relationship type are associated with other labor market outcomes such as job satisfaction and occupational prestige.

Table 4.1. Descriptive Statistics for Employment (N=12,119)

			Men (N=5,582))	Women (N=6,537)			
Variable	Full Sample	Heterosexual Men (n=5,389)	Bisexual Men (n=40)	Homosexual Men (n=153)	Heterosexual Women (n=6,253)	Bisexual Women (n=160)	Homosexual Women (n=124)	
	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	
Working 10 Hours Per Week (W4)	78.23	84.11	82.54	85.90	72.46	61.48 †	78.82	
Sexual Identity (W4)								
100%/mostly heterosexual	96.21	100.00			100.00			
Bisexual	1.66		100.00			100.00		
Mostly/100% homosexual	2.14			100.00			100.00	
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	28.39	28.52	28.27	28.62	28.28	27.79 †	28.04	
Education								
Less than High School	9.43	11.01	24.59 †	2.51	7.72	17.93 *	5.63	
High School	17.78	21.33	13.78	10.84	14.31	18.64	19.41	
Some College	43.91	41.94	40.02	42.90	45.82	45.69	49.55	
College	21.85	20.20	19.96	30.16	23.55	13.37 †	22.58	
Graduate Degree	7.03	5.52	1.64	13.60 **	8.59	4.36	2.84	
Region (W4)								
Northeast	16.55	16.17	13.43	16.65	16.91	18.91	16.30	
Midwest	31.71	31.13	52.90 †	30.94	31.96	38.98	32.00 †	
South	38.54	39.4	23.20 †	35.10	38.09	29.52	39.56 †	
West	13.20	13.30	10.47	17.31	13.05	12.58	12.14	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White	68.01	67.75	76.90	60.57	68.51	65.07	66.29	
Non-Hispanic Black	15.78	15.64	14.27	10.15	16.05	15.34	18.12	
Hispanic	11.54	11.54	7.57	20.13 †	11.24	14.08	12.99	
Other	4.63	5.01	1.25	8.68	4.19	4.98	2.60	
Current Student (W4)	15.78	12.72	6.71	18.50	18.68	13.18	31.36 *	
Child in Household (W4)	46.64	35.74	23.15	0.39 ***	59.43	55.09	16.99 **	
Union Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married	39.31	36.43	17.59	0.00 ***	44.61	20.16 **	4.27 **	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	19.15	19.95	14.63	1.02 ***	19.06	24.02	0.47 ***	
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.88	0.11	0.23	25.84 ***	0.01	9.90 **	40.52 ***	
No Coresidential	40.66	43.51	67.55 †	73.14 ***	36.31	45.93	54.74 **	

Notes: Two-tailed test of sigificance between heterosexual and other groups. $\ddagger p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001$

Table 4.2. Descriptive Statistics for Employment I	By Couple Type for Men (N=5	,582)				
			Mer	1		
Variable	Different-Sex Married (n=2,040)	Different-Sex Cohabiting (n=1,013)	Same-Sex Coresidential (n=46)	Heterosexual Single (n=2,343)	Bisexual Single (n=29)	Homosexual Single (n=111)
	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean
Working 10 Hours Per Week (W4)	90.76	84.86 *	78.98	78.27 ***	86.81	85.52
Sexual Identity (W4)						
100%/mostly heterosexual	99.67	99.360	14.48	100.00		
Bisexual	0.03	0.51	0.21		100.00	
Mostly/100% homosexual	0.00	0.13	85.32			100.00
Control Variables						
Age at Wave IV	28.92	28.27 *	28.53	28.29 *	28.28	28.69
Education						
Less than High School	9.24	15.83 *	1.48	10.51	11.50	2.82 †
High School	17.3	23.14 †	11.49	23.61 †	20.40	14.51
Some College	46.19	40.62	36.88	38.87 *	50.04	44.91
College	20.93	16.41	41.42 †	21.48	15.63	22.78
Graduate Degree	6.33	4.00	8.72	5.53	2.43	14.98 *
Region (W4)						
Northeast	15.57	14.18	15.76	17.7	4.46 **	16.24
Midwest	31.02	37.97	28.51	28.03	62.47 **	32.96
South	43.19	31.65	27.28	39.69	25.98 †	38.15
West	10.22	16.20 †	28.46 *	14.58	7.09	12.66
Race/Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic White	74.00	69.18	75.93	61.98	65.81	55.42 †
Non-Hispanic Black	9.84	18.00 †	3.52	19.35 *	21.13 *	13.06
Hispanic	11.90	8.45	12.65	12.63	11.21	22.28
Other	4.12	4.37	6.35	6.04	1.85	9.24
Current Student (W4)	11.05	10.20	15.52	15.28 *	6.58	18.96
Child in Household (W4)	69.61	39.47 ***	* 8.40 ***	5.68 ***	2.09 **	0.00 ***
Union Type (W4)						
Different-Sex Married	100.00					
Different-Sex Cohabiting		100.00				
Same-Sex Coresidential			100.00			
No Coresidential				100.00	100.00	100.00

Notes: Two-tailed test of sigificance between different-sex married and other groups. † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Table no Desemptive statistics for Employment By			Women			
		Different-Sex	Same-Sex	Heterosexual	Bisexual	Homosexual
Variable	Different-Sex	Cohabiting	Coresidential	Single	Single	Single
	Mamed (n=2,769)	(n=1,189)	(n=66)	(n=2,375)	(n=75)	(n=63)
	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean
Working 10 Hours Per Week (W4)	67.83	75.30 *	79.29	76.56 **	50.81 †	78.83
Sexual Identity (W4)						
100%/mostly heterosexual	98.59	96.590	1.32	100.00		
Bisexual	1.23	3.37	26.11		100.00	
Mostly/100% homosexual	0.18	0.04	72.56			100.00
Control Variables						
Age at Wave IV	28.55	27.94 *	27.79 †	28.13	27.72 *	27.85
Education						
Less than High School	5.67	11.47	4.79	8.54 †	18.99	9.82
High School	14.88	16.08 †	14.68	12.86	21.85	17.98
Some College	43.16	48.18	63.77 *	47.61	47.32	40.80
College	26.34	19.44 *	15.27	22.14	9.05 *	26.82
Graduate Degree	9.95	4.84 *	1.49 *	8.85	2.79 †	4.58
Region (W4)						
Northeast	15.85	17.37	21.86	18.15	15.69	11.27
Midwest	32.23	35.80	24.99	29.67	42.99	39.67
South	39.88	30.39 *	41.30	39.69	31.06	35.47
West	12.05	16.44	11.84	12.49	10.25	13.59
Race/Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic White	77.94	69.05	69.49	56.75 **	51.46 **	65.73
Non-Hispanic Black	7.67	15.08 *	18.07 †	26.73 *	23.61 **	17.16
Hispanic	10.83	11.72	10.55	11.55	17.61	12.81
Other	3.57	4.15	0.51 †	4.97	7.30	4.30
Current Student (W4)	15.03	16.30	24.41	24.20 ***	18.67	32.18 *
Child in Household (W4)	74.58	53.99 ***	* 12.33 ***	43.37 ***	64.34	16.94 ***
Union Type (W4)						
Different-Sex Married	100.00					
Different-Sex Cohabiting		100.00				
Same-Sex Coresidential			100.00			
No Coresidential				100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics for Employment By Couple Type for Women (N=6 537)

Notes: Two-tailed test of sigificance between different-sex married and other groups. † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

	Men (N=5,			Women (N=6,537)				
Variable	Zero Order		Model 1		Zero Order		Model 1	
Sexual Identity (W4)								
100%/mostly heterosexual (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Bisexual	0.892		1.100		0.607	*	0.609	*
Mostly/100% homosexual	1.151		1.697		1.414		0.971	
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	1.031		0.987		0.995		1.028	
Education								
Less than High School (ref)	-		-		-		-	
High School	1.500		1.588	t	1.396	*	1.445	*
Some College	2.133	***	2.627	* * *	2.819	***	3.225	***
College	2.885	***	3.616	***	4.935	***	4.659	***
Graduate Degree	2.269	**	3.111	***	4.436	***	4.064	***
Region (W4)								
Northeast (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Midwest	1.038		1.079		1.017		1.235	
South	1.112		1.255		0.820		0.975	
West	1.119		1.147		1.118		1.073	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Non-Hispanic Black	0.512	***	0.573	***	1.128		1.358	*
Hispanic	1.044		1.213		1.284	*	1.673	***
Other	0.748		0.810		0.956		0.867	
Current Student (W4)	0.429	***	0.343	***	0.876		0.607	***
Child in Household (W4)	1.719	***	1.163		0.380	***	0.465	***
Union Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.570	**	0.695	*	1.446	**	1.456	**
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.382	t	0.228	*	1.816	t	1.434	
Not Married/Cohabiting	0.375	***	0.454	***	1.484	***	1.301	*

Table 4.4. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Employment by Identity (N=12,119)

Notes: Survey-adjusted models.

† p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

	Men (N=5,	Women (N=6,537)						
Variable	Zero-Order		Model 1		Zero-Order		Model 1	
Couple Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married (ref)								
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.570	* *	0.697	*	1.446	**	1.442	**
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.382	Ť	0.348	*	1.816	†	1.244	
No Coresidential - Heterosexual	0.366	***	0.454	***	1.549	***	1.335	**
No Coresidential - Bisexual	0.670		0.815		0.490	*	0.537	ţ
No Coresidential - Homosexual	0.601		0.647		1.766		1.360	
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	1.031		0.987		0.995		1.028	
Education								
Less than High School (ref)								
High School	1.500		1.584	Ť	1.396	*	1.454	*
Some College	2.133	***	2.619	***	2.819	***	3.240	***
College	2.885	***	3.622	***	4.935	***	4.687	***
Graduate Degree	2.269	**	3.106	***	4.436	***	4.085	***
Region (W4)								
Northeast (ref)								
Midwest	1.038		1.074		1.017		1.243	
South	1.112		1.252		0.820		0.979	
West	1.119		1.145		1.118		1.078	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White (ref)								
Non-Hispanic Black	0.512	***	0.571	* * *	1.128		1.358	*
Hispanic	1.044		1.209		1.284	*	1.682	***
Other	0.748		0.810		0.956		0.874	
Current Student (W4)	0.429	***	0.343	* * *	0.876		0.608	
Child in Household (W4)	1.719	***	1.178		0.380	***	0.469	***

Table 4.5. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Employment by Couple Type (N=12,119)

Notes: Survey-adjusted models.

† p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

	8 ('') '')		Men (N=4,611)		Women (N=4,676)			
		Heterosexual	Bisexual	Homosexual	Heterosexual	Bisexual	Homosexual	
Variable	Full Sample	Men	Men	Men	Women	Women	Women	
	1	(n=4,446)	(n=32)	(n=133)	(n=4,487)	(n=98)	(n=91)	
	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	
Wages	17 871	19 262	12 250 **	18 442	16 448	12 305 **	15 059	
Sexual Identity (W4)	17.071	19.202	12.230	10.112	10.110	12.505	15.055	
100%/mostly heterosexual	96 34	100.00			100.00			
Bisexual	1 42		100.00			100.00		
Mostly/100% homosexual	2.24			100.00			100.00	
Control Variables	2.21			100.00			100.00	
Age at Waya W	28.41	28 54	28 55	28 71	28.28	27.83 +	28.14	
Age at wave iv	20.41	20.34	20.55	20.71	20.20	27.85	20.14	
Loss than High School	7.51	0.40	18.05	2.02 +	5 21	0.10	0.78 +	
High School	16.02	20.22	14.08	12.02	11.00	9.10 15.61	10.56 +	
Some College	10.02	20.23	14.08	12.93	11.09	50.81	19.30	
Callage	44.03	42.03	44.09	45.57	40.94	17.25	30.43 26.67	
Conege	24.04	21.05	21.77	23.87	20.97	7 14	20.07	
Graduate Degree	/.00	5.80	2.02	14.00	9.09	/.14	2.55	
Region (w4)	16.00	16.24	0.55	17.50	17.49	21.10	15.22	
Northeast	16.82	16.24	8.55	17.52	1/.48	21.10	15.32	
Midwest	32.12	31.22	61.81 *	30.29	32.810	38.43	33.79	
South	37.52	39.24	19.23 *	35.22	35.87	29.27	39.23	
West	13.54	13.30	10.41	16.97	13.84	11.20	11.65	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White	68.71	69.61	83.89	57.58	67.86	65.48	72.68	
Non-Hispanic Black	14.66	13.55	11.33	9.52	16.08	18.96	13.03	
Hispanic	12.02	11.93	0.05	22.71	11.96	8.09	11.60	
Other	4.57	4.85	0.00	10.20	4.08	7.48	2.70	
Current Student (W4)	14.34	10.96	3.07	16.16	18.21	10.35	27.06	
Child in Household (W4)	43.94	37.87	28.41	0.47 ***	53.19	44.65	11.78 ***	
Hours Worked	41.82	44.54	41.76	43.97	38.70	36.48	40.79	
Occupational Category								
Managers	7.47	7.52	4.57	20.41 **	7.11	3.19	9.29	
Professionals	26.41	21.93	16.26	51.02 **	31.03	29.41	22.14	
Technicians	3.64	1.86	2.70	2.24	5.86	0.79 *	2.95	
Sales	9.86	10.01	10.75	6.16	9.47	13.58	21.45 †	
Administrative Support	8.62	2.71	0.00	8.10	15.54	8.58	15.49	
Craft	10.30	19.05	8.52	0.06 ***	7.06	0.00	2.19	
Operatives	8.17	12.74	16.12	3.50	3.05	1.81	5.84	
Laborers	5.00	8.27	13.61	5.45 *	1.22	4.07	5.55	
Service	20.41	15.76	24.32	7.95	25.92	38.56 †	15.10 *	
Military	0.13	0.15	3.14 †	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	
Union Type								
Different-Sex Married	39.60	39.70	13.81	0.00 ***	42.54	18.40 **	3.16 ***	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	19.65	20.2	15.51	1.23 **	19.71	31.13 *	0.27 ***	
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.85	0.05	0.00	23.30 ***	0.00	12.30 ***	42.50 ***	
Not Married/Cohabiting	39.90	40.06	70.68 ***	75.47 ***	38.13	38.16	54.06 *	

Table 4.6. Descriptive Statistics for Wages (N=9,287)

Notes: Two-tailed test of sigificance between heterosexual and other groups.
	Men					
Variable	Different-Sex Married (n=1,841)	Different-Sex Cohabiting (n=828)	Same-Sex Coresidential (n=38)	Heterosexual Single (n=1,786)	Bisexual Single (n=24)	Homosexual Single (n=96)
	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean
Wages	21.966	17.504 **	27.197	17.354 ***	11.338 ***	17.320 *
Sexual Identity (W4)						
100%/mostly heterosexual	99.76	99.32	7.61	100.00		
Bisexual	0.24	0.53	0.00		100.00	
Mostly/100% homosexual	0.00	0.16	92.39			100.00
Control Variables						
Age at Wave IV	28.92	28.31 †	28.95	28.26 *	28.51	28.70
Education						
Less than High School	8.62	13.23 †	2.15	8.63	7.32	3.30
High School	17.04	22.00	2.84	22.36 †	19.92	16.92
Some College	45.94	42.36	53.46	39.86 †	51.57	41.67
College	21.71	18.63	31.52	23.24	18.33	22.24
Graduate Degree	6.69	3.77	10.40	5.91	2.86	15.87 †
Region (W4)						
Northeast	15.83	14.02	22.84	17.77	5.02 *	15.58
Midwest	30.82	37.76	15.99 †	28.34	69.27 **	34.79
South	43.39	30.51 *	29.32	39.54	17.39 *	36.87
West	9.96	17.72 *	31.86 ***	14.35	8.32	12.76
Race/Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic White	74.28	72.74	67.79	63.51 †	77.21	53.82 †
Non-Hispanic Black	9.43	15.32	4.66	16.63	16.03	11.79
Hispanic	12.17	8.23	18.34	13.57	6.77	23.96
Other	3.96	3.70	9.21	6.29	0.00	10.43 †
Current Student (W4)	9.35	9.81	10.56	13.11 *	0.81 *	17.88
Child in Household (W4)	70.05	38.75 ***	7.11 ***	5.68 ***	2.45 ***	0.05 ***
Hours Worked	46.24	43.53 **	43.72	43.34 ***	43.36	43.63
Occupational Category						
Managers	8.73	6.61	16.52	6.73	6.47	21.52 *
Professionals	24.39	15.13 ***	57.93 *	23.14	3.47 *	48.25 **
Technicians	1.63	2.10	0.00	2.03	3.82	1.34
Sales	8.49	11.54	3.37	10.76	9.24	7.04
Administrative Support	2.12	2.29	2.77	3.49	0.00	9.81 *
Craft	22.48	20.13	5.89	14.95 *	8.53	0.09 *
Operatives	13.99	14.40	1.21 *	10.6	22.37	4.24
Laborers	6.85	9.47	1.96	9.16	7.45	0.07 ***
Service	11.15	18.29 **	10.86	18.95 *	34.21 *	7.65
Military	0.15	0.04	0.00	0.20	4.45 †	0.00
Union Type					, in the second s	
Different-Sex Married	100.00					
Different-Sex Cohabiting		100.00				
Same-Sex Coresidential			100.00			
Not Married/Cohabiting				100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 4.7. Descriptive Statistics for Wages by Couple Type for Men (N=4,611)

Notes: Two-tailed test of sigificance between different-sex married and other groups. † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Table 4.8. Descriptive Statistics for Wages by Couple Type for Women (N=4,676)

	Women						
Variable	Different-Sex Married (n=1,850)	Different-Sex Cohabiting (n=880)	Same-Sex Coresidential (n=52)	Heterosexual Single (n=1,808)	Bisexual Single (n=44)	Homosexual Single (n=42)	
	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	
Wages	17.351	15.903	15.019	15.567 †	11.066 ***	16.509	
Sexual Identity (W4)							
100%/mostly heterosexual	98.82	96.32	0.29	100.00			
Bisexual	1.03	3.65	25.56		100.00		
Mostly/100% homosexual	0.15	0.03	74.15			100.00	
Control Variables							
Age at Wave IV	28.57	27.99 *	27.89	28.09 †	27.84	27.93	
Education							
Less than High School	4.43	7.72	2.04	5.17	7.27	1.45	
High School	11.72	11.71	14.89	10.32	18.57	17.05	
Some College	42.19	52.00 *	65.75 *	49.28 †	57.56	42.46	
College	30.35	23.36 †	16.17	25.00	11.10 *	34.36	
Graduate Degree	11.31	5.21 *	1.16 *	10.23	5.49	4.69	
Region (W4)							
Northeast	15.36	18.36	23.92	19.52	16.36	10.79	
Midwest	33.79	35.99	27.44	30.29	34.48	41.50	
South	37.75	28.40 †	39.06	37.48	35.78	34.76	
West	13.11	17.25	9.58	12.71	13.39	12.94	
Race/Ethnicity							
Non-Hispanic White	76.83	68.99	76.32	57.45 *	47.50 *	71.40	
Non-Hispanic Black	8.94	15.16	15.11	24.45 **	30.89 **	9.92	
Hispanic	11.27	12.30	7.91	12.46	7.36	14.29	
Other	2.96	3.54	0.66	5.62	14.25 †	4.38	
Current Student (W4)	14.70	15.31	21.67	23.41 ***	13.61	27.02	
Child in Household (W4)	67.38	50.13 ***	6.77 ***	38.97 ***	• 47.90 *	11.42 ***	
Hours Worked	38.18	38.98	39.67	39.08	35.95	40.39	
Occupational Category							
Managers	7.62	7.03	13.02	6.40	0.70 *	8.00	
Professionals	34.66	26.05 *	11.95 *	29.73	26.06	32.43	
Technicians	6.31	5.12	3.07	5.58	2.07	2.03	
Sales	9.46	10.56	28.77 *	9.21	3.96	13.88	
Administrative Support	15.51	16.08	12.33	14.99	15.80	13.27	
Craft	0.60	1.29	3.81	0.49	0.00	0.00	
Operatives	1.94	2.50	4.28	4.54	2.66	6.28	
Laborers	1.21	1.59	0.44	1.2	2.47	9.80 *	
Service	22.52	29.79	22.34	27.83 †	46.28 *	14.36	
Military	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	
Union Type							
Different-Sex Married	100.00						
Different-Sex Cohabiting		100.00					
Same-Sex Coresidential			100.00				
Not Married/Cohabiting				100.00	100.00	100.00	

Notes: Two-tailed test of sigificance between different-sex married and other groups.

† p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

	Men (N=4,611)		Women (N=4,676)			
Variable	Zero-Order F	ull Model	Zero-Order Fu	ıll Model		
Sexual Identity (W4)						
100%/mostly heterosexual (ref)						
Bisexual	-0.370 *	-0.285 †	-0.251 *	-0.169 †		
Mostly/100% homosexual	0.046	-0.048	-0.040	-0.100		
Control Variables						
Age at Wave IV	0.043 ***	0.027 **	0.033 **	0.039 ***		
Education						
Less than High School (ref)						
High School	0.180 **	0.174 **	0.210 **	0.151 †		
Some College	0.420 ***	0.376 ***	0.438 ***	0.346 ***		
College	0.659 ***	0.546 ***	0.851 ***	0.615 ***		
Graduate Degree	0.681 ***	0.518 ***	0.979 ***	0.681 ***		
Region (W4)						
Northeast (ref)						
Midwest	-0.036	-0.007	-0.157 †	-0.120 *		
South	-0.125 *	-0.063	-0.179 *	-0.106 †		
West	0.009	0.022	0.118	0.058		
Race/Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic White (ref)						
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.277 ***	-0.179 ***	-0.178 **	-0.050		
Hispanic	-0.077 †	-0.009	-0.074	0.007		
Other	0.100 †	0.066	0.194 *	0.174 *		
Current Student (W4)	-0.016	-0.084 †	0.061 †	0.016		
Child in Household (W4)	0.106 **	0.048	-0.295 ***	-0.173 ***		
Hours Worked	0.001	-0.002	0.004	-0.003		
Occupational Category						
Managers (ref)						
Professionals	0.057	0.004	0.084 *	-0.036		
Technicians	-0.004	0.012	-0.040	-0.003		
Sales	-0.282 ***	-0.232 ***	-0.353 ***	-0.271 ***		
Administrative Support	-0.396 ***	-0.299 **	-0.202 ***	-0.118 *		
Craft	-0.217 ***	-0.091 *	-0.166	0.026		
Operatives	-0.341 ***	-0.188 **	-0.581 ***	-0.400 *		
Laborers	-0.549 ***	-0.334 ***	-0.419 ***	-0.244 *		
Service	-0.376 ***	-0.255 ***	-0.476 ***	-0.348 ***		
Military	0.402 **	0.354 *	0.455 ***	0.424 ***		
Union Type						
Different-Sex Married (ref)						
Different-Sex Cohabiting	-0.263 ***	-0.164 ***	-0.078 †	-0.006		
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.149	0.050	-0.023	0.139		
Not Married/Cohabiting	-0.307 ***	-0.221 ***	-0.114 **	-0.093 *		

 Table 4.9. OLS Regressions for Log Hourly Wages: Identity N=(9,292)

Notes: Survey-adjusted models.

† p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Table 4.10. OLS Regressions for Log Hourly Wages: By Couple Type N=(9,640)

	Men (N=4,611)	Women (N=4,676)				
Variable	Zero Order Fu	ıll Model	Zero Order Full Model			
Couple Type (W4)						
Different-Sex Married (ref)						
Different-Sex Cohabiting	-0.263 ***	-0.166 ***	-0.078 †	-0.010		
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.149	0.007	-0.023	0.024		
No Coresidential - Heterosexual	-0.308 ***	-0.222 ***	-0.108 **	-0.094	*	
No Coresidential - Bisexual	-0.622 **	-0.536 *	-0.405 *	-0.260	t	
No Coresidential - Homosexual	-0.197 *	-0.245 *	-0.056	-0.085		
Control Variables						
Age at Wave IV	0.043 ***	0.027 **	0.033 **	0.039	***	
Education						
Less than High School (ref)						
High School	0.180 **	0.176 **	0.210 **	0.150	t	
Some College	0.420 ***	0.378 ***	0.438 ***	0.347	***	
College	0.659 ***	0.548 ***	0.851 ***	0.616	***	
Graduate Degree	0.681 ***	0.521 ***	0.979 ***	0.683	***	
Region (W4)						
Northeast (ref)						
Midwest	-0.036	-0.007	-0.157 †	-0.120	*	
South	-0.125 *	-0.063	-0.179 *	-0.106	t	
West	0.009	0.023	0.118	0.059		
Race/Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic White (ref)						
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.277 ***	-0.176 ***	-0.178 **	-0.049		
Hispanic	-0.077 †	-0.008	-0.074	0.008		
Other	0.100 †	0.067	0.194 *	0.174	*	
Current Student (W4)	-0.016	-0.084 †	0.061 †	0.016		
Child in Household (W4)	0.106 **	0.046	-0.295 ***	-0.172	***	
Hours Worked	0.001	-0.002	0.004	-0.003		
Occupational Category						
Managers (ref)						
Professionals	0.057	0.003	0.084 *	-0.038		
Technicians	-0.004	0.013	-0.040	-0.002		
Sales	-0.282 ***	-0.231 ***	-0.353 ***	-0.274	***	
Administrative Support	-0.396 ***	-0.299 **	-0.202 ***	-0.118	*	
Craft	-0.217 ***	-0.089 †	-0.166	0.030		
Operatives	-0.341 ***	-0.186 **	-0.581 ***	-0.401	*	
Laborers	-0.549 ***	-0.334 ***	-0.419 ***	-0.258	**	
Service	-0.376 ***	-0.253 ***	-0.476 ***	-0.349	***	
Military	0.402 **	0.358 *	0.455 ***	0.425	***	

Notes: Survey-adjusted models. † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001













CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

The social context for sexual minorities in the United States has rapidly changed over the past two decades. In the span of less than 10 years, marriage for same-sex couples went from being legal in only one state (and banned in over 40 others) to being legal in all 50 states. At the same time, more individuals are identifying as a sexual minority than ever before (Newport 2018). Against this backdrop, sexual minorities tend to have worse mental and physical health outcomes than their heterosexual counterparts (e.g., Hatzenbuheler et al. 2010; Marshal et al. 2011; National Institute of Health 2015; Ross et al. 2018; Strutz et al. 2015). Sexual minority men also face a wage penalty compared to their sexual majority counterparts (see Klawitter 2015; Mize 2016). However, less is known about how sexual orientation is associated with other outcomes. Only recently have scholars begun to examine how social context moderates associations between social orientation and some outcomes or how it differentiates these outcomes for sexual minorities.

This dissertation considers the implications of social context for processes of coming out, union formation, and status attainment among sexual minorities. I cover three distinct bodies of research on coming out, union formation, and the labor market that have evolved out of several areas and disciplines, including sociology, family demography, psychology, and economics. I address major gaps in the research on outcomes of sexual minorities by examining a wide range of individual, relationship, tract, and county-level variables among a nationally representative sample of young adults in the United States. Using the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, this dissertation draws on two major theoretical frameworks, minority stress and ecological systems theory, to provide new insights into processes underlying outcomes for sexual minorities in young adulthood. My dissertation includes a large number of sexual minorities which allows for analysis to be broken down by gender and identity. The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health provides the best data for examining sexual minorities and context. Add Health includes measures of sexual orientation identity, same-sex sexual behavior, romantic attraction, and coresidence. Add Health also includes numerous contextual databases. The measures of sexual orientation and social context allowed for a more complex and nuanced look at how sexual minorities experience social phenomena such as coming out, union formation, and labor market outcomes.

Contributions and Key Findings

First, I examined coming out to parents among sexual minorities, a category that includes respondents who identify as bisexual, mostly homosexual, or 100 percent homosexual. To my knowledge, this is the first analysis to consider the influence of demographic and contextual variables on coming out to parents. Prior examinations of coming out have focused on the internal, individualistic, process rather than social interactions within specific contexts (Orne 2011). Furthermore, coming out is often examined as an independent variable (such as in Chapter III), rather than a dependent variable. My study fills these gaps and provides new insight by examining a wide variety of demographic, familial, and contextual variables on coming out to parents.

In Chapter II, I found that bisexual men and women were significantly less likely to be out to either parent about their bisexuality than homosexual respondents were to be out about their homosexual identity. Next, consistent with the minority stress hypothesis and ecological systems theory, sexual minorities living in a tract with a medium or high concentrations of samesex couples were significantly more likely to be out to either parent than sexual minorities living in tracts with low concentrations of same-sex couples. When examining men and women separately, bisexuals still have significantly lower odds of being out to either parent. In addition, sexual minority men and women living in tracts with medium concentration of same-sex couples, but not high concentrations of same-sex couples, have higher odds of being out to either parent than those living in tracts with low concentration of same-sex couples.

Second, I examined same-sex union formation, specifically among sexual minorities, a category that includes respondents who identify as bisexual, mostly homosexual, or 100 percent homosexual. To my knowledge, this is one of the first analysis to consider the likelihood of same-sex union formation in the United States. A large body of research exists on different-sex union formation (e.g. Bumpass, Sweet, and Cherlin 1991; Goldstein and Kenney 2001; Lichter et al. 1992; Manning, Brown, and Payne 2014; Schwartz 2013) and a fair amount exists on the dissolution of same-sex unions (see Joyner et al. 2017 for summary). However, little is known about the dynamics of same-sex union formation. Prior research on same-sex union formation included heterosexuals in the risk set for same-sex union formation (Strohm 2010) or examining timing of same-sex union formation among only those who formed a union (Mernitz and Pollitt 2018). Both of these approaches make it difficult to identify the correlates of same-sex union formation. My study provides new insight into union formation by highlighting how supportive social context plays a role in same-sex union formation for sexual minorities.

In Chapter III, I found that, not surprisingly, homosexual men and women were the most likely to form a same-sex union, followed by bisexual men and women, mostly heterosexual men and women, and finally 100 percent heterosexual men and women. Consistent with the minority stress and ecological systems frameworks, I found that sexual minority women and men who were out to either parent had significantly higher likelihood of forming a same-sex union. In addition, sexual minority men (but not women) who were living in a tract with high concentration of same-sex couples (but not a moderate concentration) had a higher likelihood of forming a same-sex union than their counterparts in tracts with a low concentration of same-sex couples. In addition, similar to different-sex union formation, demographic indicators such as race and family structure play role in predicting same-sex union formation.

Third, I examined employment and wages. My dissertation contributes to the literature by providing additional evidence on outcomes for sexual minorities using a nationally representative sample of young adults in the United States. While prior research on sexual minorities in the labor market has defined sexual minorities exclusively in terms of coresidence (e.g., Allegretto and Arthur 2001; Baumle and Poston 2011; Cain and Leppel 2001; Klawitter and Flatt 1998; Poston and Rollman-Tinajero 2018) or identity (e.g., Carpenter 2005; Mize 2016), Add Health allowed me to directly compare how single sexual minorities, as well as single heterosexuals, experience employment and wages differently from individuals in same-sex coresidential unions, different-sex cohabiting unions and different-sex marriages. Mize (2016) used Add Health and examined wages by identity while controlling for marriage and cohabitation (without regard for sex composition of the couple). I expanded this classification and examined how single homosexuals, single bisexuals, single heterosexuals, individuals in same-sex coresidential unions, and individuals in different-sex cohabiting unions fare compared to individuals in different-sex married unions.

In Chapter IV, I found that, when just examining identity in the full models, bisexual and homosexual men do not significantly differ from heterosexual men in terms of employment, defined as working for pay at least 10 hours per week. However, when examining couple type, I found that men in different-sex cohabiting relationships, men in same-sex coresidential relationships, and heterosexual single men all have significantly lower odds of being employed than men in different-sex marriages. Importantly, bisexual single men and homosexual single men did not differ significantly from men in different-sex marriages when it comes to employment. Turning to wages, bisexual men had significantly lower wages than heterosexual men. Homosexual men do not have wages that significantly differ from heterosexual men. When examining relationship context, men in different-sex cohabiting unions, heterosexual single men, bisexual single men, and homosexual single men all have significantly lower wages than men in different-sex marriages. Importantly, men in same-sex coresidential unions do not differ significantly from men in different-sex marriages on wages.

Among women, bisexuals have significantly lower odds of being employed than heterosexuals. However, homosexual women did not differ from heterosexual women on employment. When examining relationship context, women in same-sex coresidential relationships and heterosexual single women have significantly higher odds of being employed while bisexual single women have significantly lower odds of being employed than women in different-sex marriages. Women in same-sex coresidential unions and homosexual single women did not differ from women in different-sex marriages when it comes to employment. Similarly, bisexual women have significantly lower wages than heterosexual women. Homosexual women have wages that do not significantly differ from heterosexual women. Looking at relationship context, only heterosexual single women and bisexual single women have significantly lower wages than women in different-sex marriages. Women in different-sex cohabiting relationships, women in same-sex coresidential unions, and homosexual single women do not differ significantly from women in different-sex marriages when it comes to wages.

These findings highlight that identity and relationship context (not just one or the other) matters for employment and wages. Our understanding of wages is obscured when we fail to take

138

into account the relationship context. Mize (2016) found a wage penalty for bisexual men and women using Add Health data. However, he only included two indicator variables for relationship context: marriage and cohabitation. These variables did not take into account the sex composition of the couple (Mize 2016). Prior to the expansion of the couple type variables, I also found a wage penalty for bisexual men and women. However, once I refined the union type variable to differentiate between same-sex and different-sex unions, the bisexual indicator fell out significance at conventional levels. I find that if we look at bisexuals without proper controls for relationship status, the wage penalty effects are overstated.

Alternatively, it is possible that returns to union status do not differ by sexual orientation identity, but rather the patterns are a function of selection. For example, Ducharme and Kollar (2012) examined the marriage benefit among a sample of married same-sex female couples and found that psychological, physical, and financial wellbeing were correlated with the health of the marriage. However, as they note, it is possible that self-selection into marriage could account, at least in part, for the marriage benefit of same-sex couples (Ducharme and Kollar 2012). In other words, it is possible that the healthier lesbian couples chose to marry compared to those in more dysfunctional relationships (Ducharme and Kollar 2012). The same logic and causal order may be at play here. It is possible that individuals who are more secure in the labor market (in terms of employment and/or wages) are more likely to get married, or form coresidential unions, than those who are not as secure in the labor market.

Finally, my dissertation contributes to our overall understanding of well-being of sexual minorities in young adulthood. Previous research posits that sexual minorities have worse outcomes than the sexual majority on indicators such as mental health (Blosnich et al. 2014; Hatzenbuheler et al. 2010; Everett 2015; Marshal et al. 2011; National Institute of Health 2015;

Ross et al. 2018), physical health (Strutz et al. 2015), and substance use (Blosnich et al. 2014; Rostosky, Danner, and Riggle 2007). However, my analyses highlight the importance of choosing a comparison group when doing research on sexual minorities. For example, while bisexuals appear to experience a wage penalty when compared to all heterosexuals, however, when comparing single bisexuals and single heterosexuals they are not significantly different. *Limitations*

While my dissertation extends our knowledge on sexual minorities and social context, there are several limitations. First, Wave IV of Add Health was collected 10 years ago. The past twenty years, and particularly the past ten years, have been a time of rapid social change for sexual minorities. For example, at the time of Wave IV only two states had legalized marriage for same-sex couples while 45 states had a constitutional or statutory ban on same-sex marriage. Therefore, it was not possible to examine same-sex marriage as an outcome nor as an independent variable. In addition, it may take time to see the effects of changing legal and social landscape to take place. As Frost and colleagues (2017) point out, "the social, political, and legal controversies surrounding same-sex marriage in the United States are deeply rooted. Their effects endure over time, and they vary across social settings and geographic locations (Frost and Fingerhut 2016)" (p. 456). Wave V of Add Health will present a unique opportunity to examine sexual minority outcomes after the legalization of marriage to same-sex couples.

Second, the analyses of employment and wages uses data from Wave IV of Add Health which was collected during the Great Recession. The Great Recession was the most severe labor market downturn since the Great Depression (Katz 2010). By 2010 the United States needed 10.6 million more jobs to get back to the employment rate prior to the start of the Great Recession (Katz 2010). As a result, this analysis is quite specific to this period and cohort of individuals. It is impossible to tell if the differences (or lack of differences) found between groups is due to couple type and identity or because of the poor economy of the time overall.

Third, because contextual data and information on sexual orientation is only available starting at Wave III, the analysis of union formation was limited to individuals who had not formed a same-sex union prior to Wave III. Although the samples of individuals who formed a same-sex union prior to Wave III did not differ significantly from the sexual minority sample used in Chapter III, it is possible that context could function differently for individuals who form unions earlier.

Fourth, the question used to operationalize coming out was only asked of bisexual and homosexual individuals at Wave III and is the only measure of coming out included in the Add Health data. Add Health does not include questions that ask about being out to friends, siblings, or in other contexts such as school or church. In addition, individuals who identified as "mostly heterosexual" were not asked if their parents knew about their sexuality. Since this question was only asked at Wave III I am unable to capture individuals who identified as bisexual or homosexual at Wave IV, but did not at Wave III.

Finally, it is unclear whether the concentration of same-sex couples measure proxies social climate, opportunity for partners, or some omitted neighborhood variable. Same-sex couples are unevenly distributed across census tracts, especially in the Midwest (Madden 2015). Also, men in same-sex couples cluster more substantially than women in same-sex couples (Madden 2015). Therefore, the concentration variable is largely driven by male couples. While it would be ideal to create separate measures of the concentration of female same-sex households and male same-sex households, this is not currently possible with Add Health data.

Implications and Future Research

Although this dissertation extends our knowledge of sexual minorities and social context, relatively little is known about sexual minorities in the United States. My dissertation suggests several avenues for future research. First, future research should also focus more on disclosure of sexual orientation identity. Coming out is a process that is unique to sexual minorities and one that separates them most significantly from their heterosexual counterparts. I found that being out to either parent was significantly associated with higher odds of forming a same-sex union among both sexual minority men and women. For many forming a same-sex union is part of the coming out process. Future research should examine how being out to either parent is associated with other outcomes such as depression, relationship quality, and relationship stability.

Next, my study has provided a first look at same-sex union formation in the United States. Building on my findings, it will be important for future studies to examine same-sex marriage. The newly collected Wave V data will allow for this research. In addition, Savin-Williams, Joyner, and Rieger (2012) examined how sexual orientation identity changed between Waves III and IV of Add Health and found, despite overall stability, the number of men identifying as 100 percent homosexual increased by half and the number of women identifying as 100 percent homosexual doubled. Future research should examine how identity, and changing identity, is associated with trajectories of union formation, with a specific emphasis on same-sex union formation.

Another important avenue for future research is to examine employment and wages among adults in the post-recession economy. At Wave V, respondents will be between 33 and 43 years old. Future research should examine if the wage penalty for gay men and wage premium for lesbian women found in previous research is also found among the cohort of Add Health respondents now that they are in adulthood. In addition, this dissertation only considered personal hourly wages. Previous research has suggested that while sexual minorities have lower personal income, same-sex couples tend to have higher household income than different-sex couples (Fisher, Gee, and Looney 2016). Future research should examine differences across couple types in household income.

Finally, future research on sexual minorities, especially research using Add Health, should make use of the contextual databases. As articulated in Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, the context in which social phenomenon occurs can be seen as "as set of 'nested structures'" where "outcomes are influenced by interactions within microsystems, or the immediate settings that contain the developing person" (Eamon 2001: 257). These systems include the micro, meso, exo, macro, and chrono levels (Hong, Espelage, and Kral 2011). As Gorman-Smith, Tolan, and Henry (2000) point out, understanding ecological risks and protective factors can inform intervention efforts.

Importantly, these levels appear to be working in different ways for sexual minority young adults. The levels of context that matter differ depending on the outcome. For example, a process that appears to be more personal and individualistic (coming out to parents) is influenced by the macro-level context (same-sex couple concentration in the census tract). In contrast, a structural process, like employment and wages, is more influenced by the micro-level context of who is in the relationship or couple. Furthermore, these processes and levels of context are connected. For example, context influences who is out, which then influences who forms a same-sex union. Being in a same-sex union is then a specific relationship context which has implications for outcomes such as employment and wages.

Overall, context matters, and it is important that future research consider varying levels of context when examining outcomes, especially for sexual and other minority groups. While some previous research has examined how social context is associated with depression among sexual minorities (Everett 2014; Everett 2015; Joyner, Prince, and Manning 2018; Wienke and Whaley 2017) future research should consider context when examining other outcomes such as self-esteem, substance use, physical health, and mortality.

Finally, future research should consider more carefully how gender plays a role in union formation of same-sex couples. Gender differences in the likelihood of first different-sex marriage are largely nonexistent (Shafer and James 2013); however, men tend to be slightly older when they enter a first marriage compared to women (Manning et al. 2014). As with marriage, men tend to be older when they enter a first different-sex cohabitation than women (Manning et al. 2014). Motivations to cohabit differ by gender as well. Huang, Smock, Manning, and Bergstrom-Lynch (2011) found that women tend to link cohabitation more closely with marriage while men weigh the possible benefits of cohabitation against remaining single. Women did not want to cohabit indefinitely and worried that cohabiting may make men less likely to want to marry (Huang et al. 2011). Men, on the other hand, saw cohabitation as sacrificing their personal freedom and autonomy (Huang et al. 2011). Cohabitation has been characterized as a union type where gender prescriptions are less institutionalized than legal marriage (Brines and Joyner 1999). While Oppenheimer's (1988) theory of marital timing has been examined in conjunction with different-sex union formation (e.g., Choi and Tienda 2017; Lewis and Oppenheimer 2000; Qian and Lichter 2018), limited research has extended examination to same-sex union formation. Future research should carefully consider how gender, sexual orientation, and sex composition of couples influences patterns of union formation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this dissertation demonstrates that social context matters for sexual minority outcomes. The analyses highlight that coming out to parents is more than just an internal process. Sexual minority men living in more supportive contexts are more likely to form a same-sex union than those living in less supportive contexts. Relationship context matters for employment and wages. Men in same-sex couples have lower odds of being employed than men in different-sex marriages, while single bisexual and homosexual men do not. Single bisexual women have lower odds of employment than women in different-sex marriages, but women in same-sex relationships do not. This analysis also reveals that the wage penalty found for bisexuals in previous research is largely a function of relationships context. Finally, the study shows that experiences of sexual minorities differ based on sexual orientation identity as well as relationship type and coresidence. While these results further our knowledge on sexual minorities and social context, future research should expand on these research questions to provide additional insight into the implications of legal recognition and protections among sexual minorities.

REFERENCES

 Allegretto, Sylvia A. and Michelle M. Arthur. 2001. "An Empirical Analysis of Homosexual/Heterosexual Male Earnings Differentials: Unmarried and Unequal?" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 54(3): 631-646.

 Allen, Samantha. 2015, June 26. "LGBT Leaders: Gay Marriage is Not Enough." *The Daily Beast.* Retrieved September 29, 2015 (http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/06/26/same-sex-marriage-is-legal-nowwhat.html).

- Alpaslan, Assim, Theresa Johnston, and Veonna Goliath. 2009. "Parents' Experiences Regarding the Coming-Out Process of a Gay or Lesbian Child." *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk*. 45(1): 27-46.
- Anderson, Deborah J., Melissa Binder, and Kate Krause. 2002. "The Motherhood Wage Penalty: Which Mothers Pay it and Why?." *American Economic Review* 92(2): 354-358.
- Antecol, Heather and Michael D. Steinberger. 2013. "Labor supply differences between married heterosexual women and partnered lesbians: A semi-parametric decomposition approach." *Economic Inquiry*. 51: 783-805.
- Antecol, Heather, Anneke Jong, and Michael Steinberger. 2008. "The Sexual Orientation Wage
 Gap: The Role of Occupational Sorting and Human Capital." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 61(4): 518-543.
- Auclert, Adrien, and Matthew Rognlie. 2018. "Inequality and Aggregate Demand." Working Paper No. 24280. *The National Bureau of Economic Research* Retrieved May 29, 2018 (http://mattrognlie.com/inequad.pdf).
- Badgett, M.V. Lee. 1995. "The Wage Effects of Sexual Orientation Discrimination." *Industrial* and Labor Relations Review 48(4): 726-739.

- Badgett, M.V. Lee, Holning Lau, Brad Sears, and Deborah Ho. 2007. "Bias in the Workplace: Consistent Evidence of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Discrimination." The Williams Institute. Retrieved June 30, 2017 (http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5h3731xr).
- Barth, Jay and L. Marvin Overby. 2003. "Are Gay Men and Lesbians in the South the New "Threat"?: Regional Comparisons of the Contact Theory." *Politics & Policy* 31(3): 452-470.
- Bauermeister, José A., Steven Meanley, Andrew Hickok, Emily Pingel, William VanHemert, and Jimena Loveluck. 2014. "Sexuality-Related Work Discrimination and Its Association with the Heath of Sexual Minority Emerging and Young Adult Men in the Detroit Metro Area." Sexuality Research and Social Policy 11(1): 1-10.
- Bauermeister, José A., Marc A. Zimmerman, Tracey E. Barnett, and Cleopatra Howard
 Caldwell. 2017. "Working in high school and adaptation in the transition to young
 adulthood among African American youth." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 36(7):
 877-890.
- Baumle, Amanda K. 2013. "The Demography of Sexuality and the Labor Market." In International Handbook on the Demography of Sexuality pp.243-253. Springer: Netherlands.
- Baumle, Amanda K. and Dudley L. Poston. 2011. "The Economic Cost of Homosexuality: Multilevel Analyses. Social Forces 89(3): 1005-1032.
- Baumle, Amanda K., and D'Lane R. Compton. 2011. "Legislating the Family: The Effects of State Family Laws on the Presence of Children in Same-Sex Household." *Law & Policy* 33 (1): 82-115.

- Baumle, Amanda K., D'Lane Compton, and Dudley L. Poston. 2009. Same-Sex Partners: The Social Demography of Sexual Orientation. SUNY Press.
- Baunach, Dawn Michelle. 2012. "Changing Same-Sex Marriage Through Attitudes in American from 1998 Through 2010." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76(2): 364-378.
- Bearman, Peter S. and James Moody. 2004. "Suicide and Friendship Among American Adolescents." *American Journal of Public Health* 94 (1): 89-95.

Becker, Gary. 1991. A Treatise on the Family. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

- Bennett, Neil G. 2017. "A reflection on the changing dynamics of union formation and dissolution." *Demographic Research* 36: 371-390.
- Berg, Nathan and Donald Lien. 2002. "Measuring the Effect of Sexual Orientation on Income: Evidence of Discrimination?" *Contemporary Economic Policy* 20(4): 394-414.
- Berg-Cross, Linda. 1988. "Lesbians, Family Process and Individuation." *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*. 3(1): 97-112.
- Betty, Joy E. and Susan L. Kirby. 2006. "Beyond the Legal Environment: How Stigma Influences Invisible Identity Groups in the Workplace." *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 18(1): 29-44.
- Black, D., Gary J. Gates, Seth Sanders, and Lowell Taylor. 2000. "Demographics of the Gay and Lesbian Population in the United States: Evidence from Available Systematic Data Sources." *Demography* 37 (2): 139-54.
- Black, Dan A., Hoda R. Makar, Seth G. Sanders, and Lowell J. Taylor. 2003. "The Earning Effects of Sexual Orientation." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 56(3): 449-469.
- Black, Dan A., Seth G. Sanders, and Lowell J. Taylor. 2007. "The Economics of Lesbian and Gay Families." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21(2): 53-70.

- Blandford, John M. 2003. "The Nexus of Sexual Orientation and Gender in the Determination of Earnings." *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 56(4): 622-642.
- Blosnich, John R., Grant W. Farmer, Joseph GL Lee, Vincent MB Silenzio, and Deborah J.
 Bowen. 2014. "Health Inequalities Among Sexual Minority Adults: Evidence from Ten US States, 2010." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 46(4): 337-349.
- Brines, Julie, and Kara Joyner. 1999. "The ties that bind: Principles of Cohesion in Cohabitation and Marriage." *American Sociological Review* 64(3): 333-355.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1988. "Interacting Systems in Human Development. Research Paradigms:
 Present and Future." In *Persons in Context: Developmental Processes* pp. 25-49.
 Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Bry, Laura Jane, Brian Mustanski, Robert Garofalo, and Michelle Nicole Burns. 2017.
 "Management of a Concealable Stigmatized Identity: A Qualitative Study of Concealment, Disclosure, and Role Flexing Among Young, Resilient Sexual and Gender-Minority Individuals." *Journal of Homosexuality*. 64(6): 745-769.
- Budig, Michelle J. 2012. "The Fatherhood Bonus & The Motherhood Penalty: Parenthood and the Gender Gap in Pay." Retrieved May 29, 2018
 (https://thirdway.imgix.net/downloads/the-fatherhood-bonus-and-the-motherhood-penalty-parenthood-and-the-gender-gap-in-pay/NEXT Fatherhood Motherhood.pdf).
- Budig, Michelle J. and Paula England. 2001. "The Wage Penalty for Motherhood." *American Sociological Review* 66: 204-225.
- Bumpass, Larry, and Hsien-Hen Lu. 2000. "Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts in the United States." *Population Studies* 54(1): 29-41.

- Bumpass, Larry L., James A. Sweet, and Andrew Cherlin. 1991. "The Role of Cohabitation in Declining Rates of Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53(4): 913-927.
- Burns, Crosby and Jeff Krehely. 2011. "Gay and Transgender People Face High Rates of Workplace Discrimination and Harassment." Center for American Progress. Retrieved July 1, 2017 (https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbt/news/2011/06/02/9872/gayand-transgender-people-face-high-rates-of-workplace-discrimination-and-harassment/).
- Cain, Roy. 1991. "Stigma Management and Gay Identity Development." *Social Work* 36(1): 67-73.
- Cain, Suzanne Heller and Karen Leppel. 2001. "An investigation into sexual orientation discrimination as an explanation for wage differences." *Applied Economics* 33: 37-47.
- Carlson, Marcia, Sara McLanahan, and Paula England. 2004. "Union formation in fragile families." *Demography* 41(2): 237-261.
- Carpenter, Christopher. 2005. "Self-Reported Sexual Orientation and Earnings: Evidence from California." *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 58(2): 258-273.
- Carpenter Christopher, and Marieka Klawitter. 2007. "19 Sexual orientation-based antidiscrimination ordinances and the earnings of sexual minority individuals." *Sexual Orientation Discrimination: An International Perspective* 4: 277-291.
- Carpiano, Richard M., Brian C. Kelly, Adam Easterbrook, and Jeffrey T. Parsons. 2011.
 "Community and Drug Use Among Gay Men: The Role of Neighborhoods and Networks." *Journal of Health & Social Behavior* 52 (1): 74-90.
- Chan, Connie S. 1989. "Issues of Identity Development Among Asian-American Lesbians and Gay Men." *Journal of Counseling & Development* 68(1): 16-20.

- Charlton, Brittany M., Allegra L. Gordon, Sari L. Reisner, Mihail Samnaliev, and S. Bryn Austin. 2016. "Disparities in Employment, Health Insurance, and Access to Care by Sexual Orientation." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 58(2): S103.
- Cheng, Siwei. 2016. "The Accumulation of (Dis) Advantage: The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Long-Term Wage Effect of Marriage." *American Sociological Review* 81(1): 29-56.
- Choi, Kate H., and Marta Tienda. 2017. "Marriage-Market Constraints and Mate-Selection Behavior: Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Differences in Intermarriage." *Journal of Marriage* and Family 79(2): 301-317.
- Chun, Hyunbae. and Injae Lee. 2001. "Why Do Married Men Earn More: Productivity or Marriage Selection?" *Economic Inquiry* 39(2):307-19.
- Cohen, Philip N. 2002. "Cohabitation and the Declining Marriage Premium for Men." *Work and Occupations* 29(3):346-63.
- Consolacion, Theodora B., Stephen T. Russell, and Stanley Sue. 2004. "Sex, Race/Ethnicity, and Romantic Attractions: Multiple Minority Status Adolescents and Mental Health." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 10(3): 200-214.
- Cook, Jonathan E., Valerie Purdie-Vaughns, Ilan H. Meyer, and Justin TA Busch. 2014.
 "Intervening within and across levels: A multilevel approach to stigma and public health." *Social Science & Medicine* 103: 101-109.
- Cornwell, Christopher and Peter Rupert. 1997. "Unobservable Individual Effects, Marriage and the Earnings of Young Men." *Economic Inquiry* 35(2):285-94.
- Correll, Shelley J., Stephen Benard, and In Paik. 2007. "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?" *American Journal of Sociology* 112(5): 1297-1339.

- Corrigan, Patrick W. and Alicia K. Matthews. 2003. "Stigma and Disclosure: Implications for Coming Out of the Closet." *Journal of Mental Health* 12(3): 235-248.
- Croteau, James M., Mary Z. Anderson, and Bonnie L. VanderWal. 2008. "Models of Workplace Sexual Identity Disclosure and Management: Reviewing and Extending Concepts. *Group* & Organization Management 33(5): 532-565.
- Clarke, Geoffrey and Purvi Sevak. 2013. "The Disappearing Gay Income Penalty." *Economics Letters* 121(3): 542-545.
- Cushing-Daniels, Brendan and Tsz-Ying Yrung. 2009. "Wage Penalties and Sexual Orientation: An Update Using the General Social Survey." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 27(2): 164-175.
- D'Augelli, Anthony R. 2002. "Mental Health Problems Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youths Ages 14-21." *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 7(3): 433-459.
- D'Augelli, Anthony R and Arnold H. Grossman .2001. "Disclosure of sexual orientation, victimization, and mental health among lesbian, gay, and bisexual older adults." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 16(10): 1008-1027.
- D'Augelli, Anthony R. and Scott L. Hershberger. 1993. "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Youth in Community Settings: Personal Challenges and Mental Health Problems." *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 21(4): 421-448.
- Day, Nancy E., and Patricia Schoenrade. 2000. "The relationship among reported disclosure of sexual orientation, anti-discrimination policies, top management support and work attitudes of gay and lesbian employees." *Personnel Review* 29(3):: 346-363.
- D'Emilio, John, William B. Turner, and Urvashi Vaid. 2002. Creating Change: Sexuality, Public Policy, and Civil Rights. St. Martin's Press.

- Denes, Amanda and Tamara D. Afifi. 2014. "Coming Out Again: Exploring GLBQ Individuals" Communication with Their Parents After the First Coming Out." *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 10(3): 298-325.
- Denton, Margaret, and Linda Boos. 2007. "The Gender Wealth Gap: Structural and Material Constraints and Implications for later life." *Journal of Women & Aging* 19(3-4): 105-120.
- Diamond, Lisa M. and Sarah Lucas. 2004. "Sexual-minority and heterosexual youths' peer relationships: Experiences, expectations, and implications for well-being." *Journal of Research on Adolescence 14*(3): 313-340.
- Diamond, Lisa M. 2000. "Sexual Identity, Attraction, and Behavior Among Young Sexual-Minority Women Over a 2-Year Period." *Developmental Psychology*. 36(2): 241-250.
- Diamond, Lisa M. 2008. Sexual Fluidity: Understanding Women's Love and Desire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dittrich, Maria L. 2005. "Coming Out to Parents: Parental Trust and Solidarity Among Only Children and Non-Only Children." Dissertation submitted to The George Washington University.
- Doyle, David Matthew and Lisa Molix. 2015. "Perceived Discrimination and Social Relationship Functioning among Sexual Minorities: Structural Stigma as a Moderating Factor." *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 15(1): 357-381.
- Dubé, Eric M. and Ritch C. Savin-Williams. 1999. "Sexual Identity Development Among Ethnic Sexual-Minority Males Youths." *Developmental Psychology*. 35(6): 1389-1398.
- Ducharme, Jamie K. and Marilou M. Kollar. 2012. "Does the "Marriage Benefit" Extend to Same-Sex Union?: Evidence from a Sample of Married Lesbian Couples in Massachusetts." *Journal of Homosexuality* 59: 580-591.

- Duncan, Dustin T. and Mark L. Hatzenbuehler. 2014. "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Hate Crimes and Suicidality Among a Population-Based Sample of Sexual-Minority Adolescents in Boston." *American Journal of Public Health* 104(2): 272-278.
- Eamon, Mary Keegan. 2001. "The Effects of Poverty on Children's Socioemotional Development: An Ecological Systems Analysis." *Social Work* 46(3): 256-266.
- Ellingson, Stephen, and Kirby Schroeder. 2004. "Race and the Construction of Same-Sex Sex
 Markets in Four Chicago Neighborhoods." Pp. 93-126 in The Sexual Organization of the
 City, edited by E. O. Lauman, S. Ellingson, J. Mahay, A. Paik, and Y. Youm. Chicago,
 IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Everett, Bethany G. 2014. "Changes in Neighborhood Characteristics and Depression Among Sexual Minority Young Adults." *Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association* 20(1): 42-52.
- Everett, Bethany. 2015. "Sexual Orientation Identity Change and Depressive Symptoms: A Longitudinal Analysis" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 56(1): 37-58.
- Fisher, Robin, Geof Gee, and Adam Looney. 2016. "Joint Filing by Same-Sex Couples after Windsor: Characteristics of Married Tax Filers in 2013 and 2014." *Washington, DC.:* Department of the Treasurey, Office of Tax Analysis. Retrieved May 24, 2018 https://www.treasur.gov/resource-center/tax-policy/tax-analysis/Documents/WP-108.PDF.
- Fisher, Mirham M., Matthijs Kalmijn, and Stephanie Steinmetz. 2016. "Does Tolerance Matter?
 A Comparative Study of Well-Being of Persons in Same-Sex and Mixed-Sex Unions
 Across Nine European Countries" *European Societies* 18(5): 514-534.

- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2015. Hate Crime Statistics. Retrieved July 15, 2017 (https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2015).
- Feldman, Sarah and A. Jordan. Wright. 2013. "Dual Impact: Outness and LGB Identity Formation on Mental Health." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*. 25(4): 443-464.
- Felson, Jacob, and Amy Adamczyk. 2017 "Effects of Geography on Mental Health Disparities on Sexual Minorities in New York City." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 47(4): 1095-1107.
- Fowler, James, Jamie Settle, and Tim Monbureau. 2010. National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health Wave III Political Context Database. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC. Retrieved May 10, 2016 (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/data/restricteduse/datasets).
- Frisch, Morten and Anders Hviid. 2006. "Childhood Family Correlates of Heterosexual and Homosexual Marriages: A National Cohort Study of Two Million Danes." Archives of Sexual Behavior 35: 533-547.
- Frost, David M., and Adam W. Fingerhut. 2016. "Daily Exposure to Negative Campaign Messages Decreases Same-Sex Couples' Psychological and Relational Well-Being." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 19(4): 477-492.
- Frost, David M., and Ilan H. Meyer. 2009. "Internalized Homophobia and Relationship Quality among Lesbians, Gay Men, and Bisexuals." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 56 (1): 97-109.
- Frost, David M. and Ilan H. Meyer. 2012. "Measuring Community Connectedness Among Diverse Sexual Minority Populations." *Journal of Sex Research* 49(1): 36-49.

 Frost, David M., Allen J. LeBlanc, Brian de Vries, Eli Alston-Stepnitz, Rob Stephenson, and Cory Woodyatt. 2017. "Couple-level Minority Stress: An Examination of Same-sex Couples' Unique Experiences." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 58(4): 455-472.

- Frye, Victoria, Beryl Koblin, John Chin, John Beard, Shannon Blaney, Perry Halkitis, David
 Vlahov, and Sandro Galea. 2010. "Neighborhood-Level Correlates of Consistent Condom
 Use among Men Who have Sex with Men: A Multi-Level Analysis." *AIDS and Behavior*14 (4): 974-85.
- Gates, Gary J. 2015. "Demographics of Married and Unmarried Same-Sex Couples: Analyses of the 2013 American Community Survey." The Williams Institute. Retrieved July 19, 2017 (http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3td6n3q0#page-1).
- Gates, Gary J. 2017. "In US, More Adults Identifying as LGBT" Gallup. Retrieved July 14, 2017 (http://www.gallup.com/poll/201731/lgbt-identification-rises.aspx).
- Gates, Gary J., and Jason Ost. 2004. *The Gay & Lesbian Atlas*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Gautier, Pieter A., Michael Svarer, and Coen N. Teulings. 2010. "Marriage and the City: Search Frictions and Sorting of Singles." *Journal of Urban Economics* 67 (2): 206-18.
- Ginther, Donna K and Madeline Zavodny. 2001. "Is the Male Marriage Premium Due to Selection? The Effect of Shotgun Weddings on the Return to Marriage." *Journal of Population Economics* 14(2):313-28.
- Glauber, Rebecca. 2000. "Race and Gender in Families and at Work: The Fatherhood Wage Premium." *Gender & Society* 22(1): 8-30.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Goldberg, Abbie E. and Aline Sayer. 2006. "Lesbian Couples' Relationship Quality Across the Transition to Parenthood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68: 87-100.
- Goldstein, Joshua R., and Catherine T. Kenney. 2001. "Marriage Delayed or Marriage Forgone?
 New Cohort Forecasts of First Marriage for US Women." *American Sociological Review* 66(4): 506-519.
- Goodenow, Carol, Laura Szalacha, and Kim Westheimer. 2006. "School Support Groups, Other School Factors, and the Safety of Sexual Minority Adolescents." *Psychology in the Schools* 43(5): 573-589.
- Gordon-Larsen, Penny, David K. Guilkey, and Barry M. Popkin. 2011. "An Economic Analysis of Community-Level Fast Food Prices and Individual-level Fast Food Intake: A Longitudinal Study." *Health & Place* 17(6): 1235-1241.
- Gorman-Smith, Deborah, Patrick H. Tolan, and David B. Henry. 2000. "A Developmental-Ecological Model of the Relation of Family Functioning to Patterns of Delinquency." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 16(2): 169-198.
- Green, Robert-Jay. 1996. "Lesbians, Gay Men, and their Parents: A Critique of LaSala and the Prevailing Clinical "Wisdom". *Family Process* 39(2): 257-266.
- Grov, Christian, David S. Bimbi, Jose E. Nanin, and Jeffrey T. Parsons. 2006. "Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Generational Factors Associated with the Coming-Out Process Among Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Individuals." *The Journal of Sex Research*. 43(2): 115-121.
- Guittar, Nicholas A. 2011. "Out: A Sociological Analysis of Coming Out." Dissertation submitted to the University of Central Florida.
- Guzzo, Karen Benjamin. 2006. "The relationship between life course events and union formation." *Social Science Research* 35(2): 384-408.

- Harris, Kathleen Mullan. 2013. "The Add Health Study: Design and Accomplishments" Retrieved May 24, 2018 (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/documentation/guides/DesignPaperWIIV.pdf)).
- Harris, K. M., Halpern, C.T., Whitsel, E., Hussey, J., Tabor, J., Entzel, P., and Udry, J.R. (2009).
 "The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Research Design." Carolina Population Center, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC. Retrieved September 23, 2014 (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design).
- Hatzenbuehler, Mark L. 2014. "Structural Stigma and the Health of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 23(2): 127-132.
- Hatzenbuehler, Mark L and Bruce Link. 2014. "Introduction to Special Issues on Structural Stigma and Health." *Social Science & Medicine* 103: 1-6.
- Hatzenbuehler, Mark L., Katie A. McLaughlin, Katherine M. Keyes, and Deborah S. Hasin.
 2010. "The Impact of Institutional Discrimination on Psychiatric Disorders in Lesbian,
 Gay, and Bisexual Populations: A Prospective Study." *American Journal of Public Health* 100(3): 452-459.
- Hatzenbuehler, Mark L., Katherine M. Keyes, and Deborah S. Hasin. 2009. "State-Level Policies and Psychiatric Morbidity in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations." *American Journal* of Public Health 99(12): 2275-2281.
- Hatzenbuehler, Mark L., Hee-Jin Jun, Heather L. Corliss, and S. Bryn Austin. 2014. "Structural Stigma and Cigarette Smoking in a Prospective Cohort Study of Sexual Minority and Heterosexual Youth." *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 47: 48-56.

- Heatherington, Laurie, and Justin A. Lavner. 2008. "Coming to Terms with Coming Out: Review and Recommendations for Family Systems-Focused Research. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 22(3): 329-343.
- Herek, Gregory M. 2002. "Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Bisexual Men and Women in the United States" *The Journal of Sex Research* 39(4): 264-274
- Herek, Gregory M., Aaron T. Norton, Thomas J. Allen, and Charles L. Sims. 2010.
 "Demographic, Psychological, and Social Characteristics of Self-Identified Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Adults in a US Probability Sample." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 7(3): 176-200.
- Hersch, Joni and Leslie S Stratton. 2000. "Household Specialization and the Male Marriage Wage Premium." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 54(1):78-94
- Hicks, Gary R. and Tien-Tsung Lee. 2006. "Public Attitudes Toward Gays and Lesbians." Journal of Homosexuality 51(2): 57-77.
- Hodges, Melissa J., and Michelle J. Budig. 2010. "Who gets the daddy bonus? Organizational hegemonic masculinity and the impact of fatherhood on earnings." *Gender & Society* 24(6): 717-745.
- Hong, Jun Sung, Dorothy L. Espelage, and Michael J. Kral. 2011. "Understanding Suicide
 Among Sexual Minority Youth in America: An Ecological Systems Analysis." *Journal of Adolescence* 34(5): 885-894.
- Human Rights Campaign. 2007. "Corporate Equality Index." Retrieved July 18, 2017 (http://www.hrc.org/campaigns/corporate-equality-index).
- Human Rights Campaign. 2015. Resources. Retrieved April 24, 2015 (http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/employment-non-discrimination-act).

- Human Rights Campaign. 2018. "Maps of State Laws and Policies." Retrieved May 24, 2018 (http://www.hrc.org/state_maps).
- Human Rights Campaign. 2017. "Workplace Discrimination Laws and Policies." Retrieved July 15, 2017 (http://www.hrc.org/resources/Workplace-Discrimination-Policies-Laws-and-Legislation).
- Huang, Penelope M., Pamela J. Smock, Wendy D. Manning, and Cara A. Bergstrom-Lynch.
 2011. "He says, she says: Gender and Cohabitation." *Journal of Family Issues* 32(7): 876-905.
- James, Jonathan. 2012. "The College Wage Premium" *Economic Commentary* Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. Retrieved May 29, 2018 (https://www.clevelandfed.org/newsroomand-events/publications/economic-commentary/economic-commentary-archives/2012economic-commentaries/ec-201210-the-college-wage-premium.aspx).
- Johnson, George E. 1997. "Changes in Earnings Inequality: The Role of Demand Shifts." Journal of Economic Perspectives 11(2): 41-54.
- Johnson, Kerri L., Simone Gill, Victoria Reichman, and Louis G. Tassinary. 2007. "Swagger, sway, and sexuality: Judging sexual orientation from body motion and morphology." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 93(3): 321-334.
- Jones, Jeffrey M. 2016. "Same-Sex Marriages Up One Year After Supreme Court Verdict." Gallup. Retrieved July 19, 2017 (http://www.gallup.com/poll/193055/sex-marriages-oneyear-supreme-court-

verdict.aspx?g source=Social%20Issues&g medium=lead&g campaign=tiles).

Jordan, Karen M. and Robert H. Deluty. 1998. "Coming Out for Lesbian Women." *Journal of Homosexuality* 35(2): 41-63.

- Joyner, Kara. 2016. Developing and Submitting an Ancillary Study Proposal. Presented at the 2016 Add Health Users Conference. Retrieved September 29, 2016 (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/events/AddHealthUsersConferenceJoyner.pd f).
- Joyner, Kara, Wendy D. Manning, and Ryan Bogle. 2017. "Gender and the Stability of Same-Sex and Different-Sex Relationships." *Demography* 54(6): 2351-2374.
- Joyner, Kara, Barbara Prince, and Wendy Manning. 2018. "Context and the Psychological Well-Being of Sexual Minorities in Young Adulthood." Paper presented at the 2018 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.
- Juster, Robert-Paul, Nathan Grant Smith, Emilie Ouellet, Shireen Sindi, and Sonia J. Lupien. 2013. "Sexual Orientation and Disclosure in Relation to Psychiatric Symptoms, Diurnal Cortisol, and Allostatic Load." *Psychosomatic Medicine* 75: 103-116.
- Kaplan, David M. 2014. "Career Anchors and Paths: The case of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Workers." *Human Resource Management Review* 24: 119-130.
- Kastanis, Angeliki and Gary J. Gates. 2013a; "LGBT Asian and Pacific Islander Individuals and Same-sex Couples." The Williams Institute. Retrieved July 9, 2017 (http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Census-2010-API-Final.pdf).

Kastanis, Angeliki and Gary J. Gates. 2013b; "LGBT African-Americans and African-American Same-sex Couples." The Williams Institute. Retrieved July 9, 2017 (http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Census-AFAMER-Oct-2013.pdf).

- Kastanis, Angeliki and Gary J. Gates. 2013c. 'LGBT Latino/a Individuals and Latino/a Same-sex Couples." The Williams Institute. Retrieved July 19 2017 (http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Census-2010-Latino-Final.pdf).
- Katz, Lawrence F. 2010. "Long-Term Unemployment in the Great Recession" Testimony for the Joint Economic Committee U.S. Congress. Retrieved May 20, 2018 (http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/lkatz/files/long_term_unemployment_in_the_great_reces sion.pdf).
- Katz, Lawrence F. and Kevin M. Murphy. 1992. "Changes in Relative Wages, 1963-1987:Supply and Demand Factors." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107(1): 35-78.
- Killewald, Alexandra. 2013. "A Reconsideration of the Fatherhood Premium: Marriage,
 Coresidence, Biology, and Fathers' Wages." *American Sociological Review* 78(1): 96-116.
- Killewald, Alexandra and Margaret Gough. 2013. "Does Specialization Explain Marriage Penalties and Premiums?". *American Sociological Review* 78(3):477-502.
- Killewald, Alexandra, and Ian Lundberg. 2017. "New evidence against a causal marriage wage premium." *Demography* 54(3): 1007-1028.
- King, Michael and Annie Bartlett. 2006. "What Same Sex Civil Partnerships May Mean for Health" *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 60: 188-191.
- Klawitter, Marieka. 2011. "Multilevel Analysis of the Effects of Antidiscrimination Policies on Earnings by Sexual Orientation." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 30(2): 334-358.
- Klawitter, Marieka.2015. "Meta-analysis of the effects of sexual orientation on earnings." *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 54(1): 4-32.
- Klawitter, Marieka M., and Victor Flatt. 1998. "The effects of state and local antidiscrimination policies on earnings for gays and lesbians." *Journal of policy analysis and management* 17(4): 658-686.
- Korenman, Sanders and David Neumark. 1991. "Does Marriage Really Make Men More Productive?". *Journal of Human Resources* 26(2):282-307.
- Kosciw, Joseph G., Neal A. Palmer, and Ryan M. Kull. 2015. "Reflecting Resiliency: Openness About Sexual Orientation and/or Gender Identity and Its Relationship to Well-Being and Educational Outcomes for LGBT Students." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 55(1-2): 167-178.
- Kuhl, Danielle C., David F. Warner, and Andrew Wilczak 2012. "Adolescent violent victimization and precocious union formation." *Criminology* 50(4): 1089-1127.
- LaMar, Lisa, and Mary Kite. 1998. "Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective." *Journal of Sex Research* 35(2): 189-196.
- Lamidi, Esther and Wendy D. Manning. 2016. "Marriage and Cohabitation Experiences Among Young Adults." *Family Profiles*, FP 16-17. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Marriage and Family Research (https://www.bgsu.edu/ncfmr/resources/data/familyprofiles/lamidi-manning-marriage-cohabitation-young-adults-fp-16-17.html).
- LaSala, Michael C. 2000. "Gay Male Couples: The Importance of Coming Out to Being Out to Parents." *Journal of Homosexuality*. 39: 47-71.
- Laumann, Edward O., John H. Gagnon, Robert T. Michael, and Stuart Michaels. 1994. *The Social Organization of Sexuality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Legate, Nicole, Richard M. Ryan, and Netta Weinstein. 2012. "Is Coming Out Always a "Good Thing"? Exploring the Relations of Autonomy Support, Outness, and Wellness for

Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Individuals." *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 3(2); 145-152.

- Leppel, Karen. 2014. "Does job satisfaction vary with sexual orientation?." *Industrial Relations:* A Journal of Economy and Society 5(2): 169-198.
- Lewis, Susan K., and Valerie K. Oppenheimer. 2000. "Educational assortative mating across marriage markets: Nonhispanic whites in the United States." *Demography* 37(1): 29-40.
- Lichter, Daniel T., Diane K. McLaughlin, George Kephart, and David J. Landry. 1992. "Race and the Retreat from Marriage: A Shortage of Marriageable Men?." *American Sociological Review* 57(6): 781-799.
- Lipka, Michael. 2014. "Gay Marriage Arrives in the South, Where the Public is Less Enthused" Pew Research Center. Retrieved May 26, 2018 (http://www.pewresearch.org/facttank/2014/10/15/gay-marriage-arrives-in-the-south-where-the-public-is-less-enthused/).
- Lopez, Mark Hugo. 2013. "Personal Milestones in the Coming Out Experience." Pew Research Center Social & Demographic Trends. Retrieved July 15, 2017 (http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/06/13/the-coming-out-experience-age-when-youfirst-thought-knew-told/).
- Lundberg, Shelly, and Elaina Rose. 2000. "Parenthood and the Earnings of Married Men and Women." *Labour Economics* 7(6): 689-710.
- Lundberg, Shelly, and Elaina Rose. 2002. "The Effects of Sons and Daughters on Men's Labor Supply and Wages." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84(2): 251-268.
- Madden, Janice F. 2015. "Gayborhoods: Economic Development and the Concentration of Same-Sex Couples in Neighborhoods with Large American Cities." In *Regional Science*

Matters: Studies Dedicated to Walter Isard pp. 399-420. New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

- Maguen, Shira, Frank J. Floyd, Roger Bakeman, and Lisa Armistead. 2002. "Developmental milestones and disclosure of sexual orientation among gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth." *Applied Developmental Psychology*. 23: 219-233.
- Maroto, Michelle, and Laura Aylsworth. 2017. "Assessing the Relationship Between Gender, Household Structure, and Net Worth in the United States." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 38(4): 556-571.
- Marshal, Michael P., Laura J. Dietz, Mark S. Friedman, Ron Stall, Helen A. Smith, James McGinley, Brian C. Thoma, Pamela J. Murray, Anthony R. D'Augelli, and David A. Brent. 2011. "Suicidality and Depression Disparities between Sexual Minority and Heterosexual Youth: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 49(2): 115-123.
- Maslowe, Kathryn E., and Mark A. Yarhouse. 2015. "Christian Parental Reactions When a LGB Child Comes Out." *The American Journal of Family Therapy*. 43(4): 352-363.
- Manning, Wendy D. and Kara Joyner. Forthcoming. "Demographic Approaches to Same-Sex Relationship Dissolution and Divorce: Data Challenges and Implications for Research" in *LGBTQ Divorce and Relationship Dissolution: Psychological and Legal Perspectives and Implications for Practice* (Oxford; Eds. Abbie Goldberg & Adam Romero).
- Martell, Michael E. and Mary Eschelbach Hansen. 2014. "Self-Identified Sexual Orientation and the Lesbian Earnings Differential." American University Economics Working Papers. Retrieved July 4, 2017 (http://www.american.edu/cas/economics/research/upload/2014-13.pdf).

- Martell, Michael E., and Mary Eschelbach Hansen. 2017. "Sexual identity and the lesbian earnings differential in the US." *Review of Social Economy* 75(2):159-180.
- McLeod, Jane D. 2015. "Why and How Inequality Matters." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 56(2): 149-165.
- McVeigh, Rory and D. Diaz Maria-Elena. 2009. "Voting to Ban Same-Sex Marriage: Interest, Values, and Communities." *American Sociological Review* 74(6): 891-915.
- Mernitz, Sara and Amanda Pollitt. 2018. "Same-Sex Union Formation During the Transition to Adulthood." Paper presented at the 2018 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.
- Meyer, Ilan H. 1995. "Minority Stress and Mental Health." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 36: 38-56.
- Meyer, Ilan H. 2003. "Prejudice, Social Stress, and Mental Health in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations: Conceptual Issues and Research Evidence." *Psychological Bulletin* 129 (5): 674-97.
- Mize, Trenton D. 2016. "Sexual Orientation in the Labor Market." *American Sociological Review* 81(6): 1132-1160.
- Morris, Jessica F., Craig W. Waldo, and Esther D. Rothblum. 2001. "A Model of Predictors and Outness Among Lesbian and Bisexual Women." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 71(1): 61-71.
- National Center for Family and Marriage Research. 2013. "Sexual Orientation Based on Coresidence Question Crosswalk" Retrieved April 13, 2017 from (http://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-

sciences/NCFMR/documents/Data/Question%20Crosswalks/sexual-orientationcoresidence.pdf).

- National Institutes of Health. 2015. FY 2016-2020 Strategic Plan to Advance Research on the Health and Well-being of Sexual and Gender Minorities (https://dpcpsi.nih.gov/sgmro).
- Newman, Bernie Sue and Peter Gerard Muzzonigro. 1993. "The Effects of Traditional Family Values on the Coming Out Process of Gay Male Adolescents." *Adolescence*. 28(109): 213-226.
- Newport, Frank. 2018. "In U.S., Estimate of LGBT Population Rises to 4.5%" Retrieved May 22, 2018 (http://news.gallup.com/poll/234863/estimate-lgbt-population-rises.aspx).
- Nordenmark, Mikael. 2017. "Unemployment and Family Life: The Relationship Among Employment Status, Household Division of Labour and Well-Being." In *Walking a Tightrope: Meeting the Challenges of Work and Family*, pp. 25-41. England: Routledge.
- Oldenburg, Catherine E., Amaya G. Perez-Brumer, Mark L. Hatzenbuehler, Douglas Krakower, David S. Novak, Matthew J. Mimiaga, and Kenneth H. Mayer. 2015. "State-level Structural Sexual Stigma and HIV Prevention in a National Online Sample of HIV-Uninfected Men who have Sex with Men in the United States." *AIDS* 29(7): 837-845.
- Oppenheimer, Valerie Kincade. 1988. "A Theory of Marriage Timing." *American Journal of Sociology* 94(3): 563-591.
- Orne, Jason. 2011. "You will always have to "out" yourself: Reconsidering coming out through strategic outness." *Sexualities*. 14(6): 681-703.
- Oswald, Ramona Faith. 2000. "Family and Friendship Relationships After Young Adult Women Come Out as Bisexual or Lesbian." *Journal of Homosexuality*. 38(3): 65-83.

Oswald, Ramona Faith, Courtney Chuthbertson, Vanja Lazarevic, and Abbie Goldberg. 2010.

"New Developments in the Field: Measuring Community Climate." *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 6: 214-228.

- Ozeren, Emir. 2014. "Sexual Orientation Discrimination in the Workplace: A Systematic Review of Literature." *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences* 109: 1203-1215.
- Paik, Anthony. 2015. "Surveying Sexualities: Minimizing Survey Error in Study of Sexuality."
 In Handbook of the Sociology of Sexualities (pp. 93-107). Springer International
 Publishing.
- Penn, Ben. 2013. "LGBT Minorities Face High Unemployment, Job Discrimination, Low Wages, Study Finds." Bloomberg BNA. Retrieved July 19, 2017 (https://www.bna.com/lgbt-minorities-face-high-unemployment-job-discrimination-lowwages-study-finds/).
- Pew Research Center. 2013a. "A Survey of LGBT Americans." Retrieved July 15, 2017 (http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/06/13/a-survey-of-lgbt-americans/).
- Pew Research Center. 2013b. "In Gay Marriage Debate, Both Supporters and Opponents See Legal Recognition as 'Inevitable'." Retrieved July 15, 2017 (http://www.peoplepress.org/2013/06/06/in-gay-marriage-debate-both-supporters-and-opponents-see-legalrecognition-as-inevitable/).
- Piore, Michael J. 1973. "Fragments of a "Sociological" Theory of Wages." *The American Economic Review* 63(2): 377- 384.
- Poston, Dudley and Cheryl Rollman-Tinajero. 2018. "Multi-Level Analyses of the Economic Effects of Homosexuality: United States, 2011-2015." Paper presented at the 2018 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

- Powell, Brian, Catherine Blozendahl, Claudia Geist, and Lala Carr Steelman. 2010. *Counted out: Same-sex relations and Americans' definitions of family*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Puckett, Jae A., Michael E. Newcomb, Daniel T. Ryan, Greg Swann, Robert Garofalo, and Brian Mustanski. 2017. "Internalized homophobia and perceived stigma: A validation study of stigma measures in a sample of young men who have sex with men." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 14(1): 1-16.
- Qian, Zhenchao, and Daniel T. Lichter. 2018. "Marriage Markets and Intermarriage: Exchange in First Marriages and Remarriages." *Demography*.
- Ragins, Belle Rose. 2004. "Sexual Orientation in the Workplace: The Unique Work and Career Experiences of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Workers." *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* 23: 35-120.
- Ragins, Belle Rose and John M. Cornwell. 2001. "Pink Triangles: Antecedents and Consequences of Percieved Workplace Discrimination Against Gay and Lesbian Employees." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(6): 1244-1261.
- Ragins, Belle Rose, Romila Singh, and John M. Cornwell. 2007. "Making the invisible visible: fear and disclosure of sexual orientation at work." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(4): 1103-1118.
- Raley, R. Kelly. 1996. "A shortage of marriageable men? A note on the role of cohabitation in black-white differences in marriage rates." *American Sociological Review* 61(6): 973-983.

- Raley, R. Kelly, Sarah Crissey, and Chandra Muller. 2007. "Of sex and romance: Late adolescent relationships and young adult union formation." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69(5): 1210-1226.
- Raley, R. Kelly, Megan M. Sweeney, and Danielle Wondra. 2015. "The growing racial and ethnic divide in US marriage patterns." *Future Child* 25(2): 89-109.

Republican National Committee. 2016. "Republican Platform." Retrieved April 3, 2017 (https://prod-static-ngoppbl.s3.amazonaws.com/media/documents/DRAFT_12_FINAL%5b1%5dben 1468872234.pdf?mid=76323&rid=13483726).

- Riggle, Ellen D. B., Sharon S. Rostosky, Whitney W. Black, and Danielle E. Rosenkrantz. 2017.
 "Outness, Concealment, and Authenticity: Associations With LGB Individuals' Psychological Distress and Well-Being." *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity* 4(1): 54-62.
- Rosario, Margaret, Eric W. Schrimshaw, and Joyce Hunter. 2004. "Ethnic/Racial Differences in the Coming-Out Process of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youths: A Comparison of Sexual Identity." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 10(3): 215-228.
- Rosario, Margaret, Eric W. Schrimshaw, and Joyce Hunter. 2009. "Disclosure of Sexual Orientation and Subsequent Substance Use and Abuse Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youths: Critical Role of Disclosure Reactions." *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2(1): 175-184.
- Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2007. *The Age of Independence: Interracial Unions, Same-Sex Unions, and the Changing American Family.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Rosenfeld, Michael J. and Byung-Soo Kim. 2005. "The Independence of Young Adults and the Rise of Interracial and Same-Sex Unions." *American Sociological Review* 70(4): 541-562.
- Ross, Lori E., Travis Salway, Lesley A. Tarasoff, Jenna M. MacKay, Blake W. Hawkins, and Charles P. Fehr. 2018. "Prevalence of Depression and Anxiety Among Bisexual People Compared to Gay, Lesbian, and Heterosexual Individuals: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *The Journal of Sex Research* 55(4-5): 435-456.
- Rossi, Nicole E. 2010. "Coming Out: Stories of Gay and Lesbian Young Adults." *Journal of Homosexuality.* 57(9): 1174-1191.
- Rostosky, Sharon S., Fred Danner, and Ellen DB Riggle. 2007. "Is Religiosity a Protective Factor Against Substance Use in Young Adulthood? Only if You're Straight!." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 40(5): 440-447.
- Rotheram-Borus, Mary Jane, and M. Isabel Fernandez. 1995. "Sexual orientation and developmental challenges experienced by gay and lesbian youths." *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior* 25(1): 26-34.
- Rostosky Sharon Scales, Fred Danner, and Ellen D. B. Riggle. 2010. "Religiosity as a Protective Factor against Heavy Episodic Drinking (HED) in Heterosexual, Bisexual, Gay, and Lesbian Young Adults." *Journal of Homosexuality* 57(8): 1039-1050.
- Rostosky, Sharon Scales, and Ellen DB Riggle. 2017. "Same-sex relationships and minority stress." *Current Opinion in Psychology* 13: 29-38.
- Rudd, Nancy A. 1996. "Appearance and self-presentation research in gay consumer cultures: Issues and impact." *Journal of Homosexuality* 31(1-2): 109-134.

- Rule, Nicholas O., and Nalini Ambady. 2008. "Brief exposures: Male sexual orientation is accurately perceived at 50ms." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 44(4):1100-1105.
- Rule, Nicholas O., Nalini Ambady, and Katherine C. Hallett. 2009. "Female sexual orientation is perceived accurately, rapidly, and automatically from the face and its features." *Journal* of Experimental Social Psychology 45(6): 1245-1251.
- Russell, Stephen T., Hinda Seif, and Nhan L. Truong. 2001. "School Outcomes of Sexual Minority Youth in the United States: Evidence from a National Study." *Journal of Adolescence* 24(1): 111-127.
- Rust, Paula C. 1993. ""Coming out" in the age of social constructionism: Sexual identity formation among lesbian and bisexual women." *Gender & Society* 7(1): 50-77.
- Ryan, Suzanne, Kerry Franzetta, Erin Schelar, and Jennifer Manlove. 2009. "Family Structure History: Links to Relationship Formation Behaviors in Young Adulthood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71(4): 935-953.
- Ryan, William S., Nicole Legate, and Netta Weinstein. 2015. "Coming Out as Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual: The Lasting Impact of Initial Disclosure Experiences. *Self and Identity*. 14(5): 549-569.
- Ryan, William S., Nicole Legate, Netta Weinstein, and Qazi Rahman. 2017. "Autonomy support fosters lesbian, gay, and bisexual identity disclosure and wellness, especially for those with internalized homophobia." *Journal of Social Issues* 73(2): 289-306.
- Sabia, Joseph J. 2014. "Sexual Orientation and Wages in Young Adulthood: New Evidence from Add Health." *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 67(1): 239-267.

- Sassler, Sharon, Katherine Michelmore, and Zhenchao Qian. 2018. "Transitions From Sexual Relationships Into Cohabitation and Beyond." *Demography* 55(2): 511-534.
- Savin-Williams, Ritch C., Kara Joyner, and Gerulf Rieger. 2012. "Prevalence and Stability of Self-Reported Sexual Orientation Identity During Young Adulthood." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 41(1): 103-110.
- Savin-Williams, Ritch C., and Lisa M. Diamond.2000. "Sexual identity trajectories among sexual-minority youths: Gender comparisons." *Archives of sexual behavior* 29(6): 607-627.
- Sawyer, Katina B., Christian N. Thoroughgood, and Jeanette N. Cleveland. 2015. "Challenging Heteronormative and Gendered Assumptions in Work-Family Research: An Examination of LGB Identity-Based Work-Family Conflict" in *Gender and the Work-Family Experience* by M. J. Mills (ed.). Springer International Publishing: Sweden.
- Scherrer, Kristin S., Emily Kazyak, and Rachel M. Schmitz. 2015. "Getting "Bi" in the Family:
 Bisexual People's Disclosure Experiences. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 77(3): 680-696.
- Schmidt, Lucie, and Purvi Sevak. 2006. "Gender, marriage, and asset accumulation in the United States." *Feminist Economics* 12(1-2): 139-166.
- Schwartz, Christine R. 2013. "Trends and Variation in Assortative Mating: Causes and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 39: 451-470.
- Schwartz, Christine R., and Nikki L.Graf. 2010. "Can Differences in Partner Availability Explain
 Differences in Interracial/Ethnic Matching Between Same- and Different-Sex Couples?"
 CDE Working Paper No. 2010-07, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of
 Wisconsin, Madison, WI.

- Sears, Brad and Christy Mallory. 2011. "Documented Evidence of Employment Discrimination and Its Effects on LGBT People." The Williams Institute. Retrieved July 1, 2017 (https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/discrimination/documented-evidence-ofemployment-discrimination-its-effects-on-lgbt-people/).
- Seidman, Steven. 2002. *Beyond the closet: The transformation of gay and lesbian life*. Psychology Press.
- Shafer, Kevin, and Spencer L. James. 2013. "Gender and Socioeconomic Status Differences in First and Second Marriage Formation." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75(3): 544-564.
- Shore, Lynn M., Beth G. Chung-Herrera, Michelle A. Dean, Karen Holocombe Ehrhart, Don I. Jung, Amy E. Randel, and Gangaram Singh. 2009. "Diversity in Organizations: Where Are We Now and Where Are We Going?" *Human Resource Management Review* 19(2): 117-133.
- Skipworth, Sue Ann. Andrew Garner, and Bryan J. Dettrey. 2010. "Limitations of the Contact Hypothesis: Heterogeneity in the Contact Effect on Attitudes toward Gay Rights." *Politics & Policy* 38(5): 887-906.
- Smith, Tom W. 2011. "Public Attitudes toward Homosexuality." Retrieved July 13, 2017 (http://www.norc.org/PDFs/2011%20GSS%20Reports/GSS_Public%20Attitudes%20To ward%20Homosexuality_Sept2011.pdf).
- Starks, Tyrel J., Michael E. Newcomb, and Brian Mustanski. 2015. "A Longitudinal Study of Interpersonal Relationships Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Adolescents and Young Adults: Mediational Pathways from Attachment to Romantic Relationship Quality." *Arch Sex Behav.* 44(7): 1821-1831.

Strohm, Charles Quincannon. 2010. "The Formation and Stability of Same-Sex and Different-

Sex Relationships." A Dissertation submitted to the University of California, Los Angeles.

- Strutz, Kelly L., Amy H. Herring, and Carolyn Tucker Halpern. 2015. "Health Disparities Among Young Adult Sexual Minorities in the US." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 48(1): 76-88.
- Swisher, Raymond R. 2008. National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Wave III Contextual Database Codebook, Part I. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC. Retrieved May 10, 2016 (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/data/restricteduse/datasets).
- Tejeda, Manuel J. 2006. "Nondiscrimination Policies and Sexual Identity Disclosure: Do They Make a Difference in Employee Outcomes?" *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 18(1): 45-59.
- Tilcisk, Andras. 2011. "Pride and Prejudice: Employment Discrimination against Openly Gay Men in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(2): 586-626.
- Tilcsik, András, Michel Anteby, and Carly R. Knight. "Concealable stigma and occupational segregation: Toward a theory of gay and lesbian occupations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 60.3 (2015): 446-481.
- Todosijevic, Jelica, Esther D. Rothblum, and Sondra E. Solomon. 2005. "Relationship Satisfaction, Affectivity, and Gay-Specific Stressors in Same-Sex Couples Joined in Civil Unions." *Psychology of Women Quarterly 29*: 158-166.
- Ueno, Koji, Teresa Roach, and Abráham E. Peña-Talamantes. 2013. "Sexual orientation and gender typicality of the occupation in young adulthood." *Social Forces* 92(1): 81-108.

- Ueno, Koji, Preeti Vaghela, and Lacey J. Ritter. 2014. "Sexual Orientation, Internal Migration, and Mental Health during the Transition to Adulthood." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 55(4): 461-481.
- Umberson, Debra, and Rhiannon A. Kroeger. 2016. "Gender, marriage, and health for same-sex and different-sex couples: The future keeps arriving." In *Gender and Couple Relationships*. Pp. 189-213. Springer International Publishing.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2016. "Families and Living Arrangements." Retrieved (http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/marital.html).
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 2017. "Examples of LGBT-Related Sex Discrimination Claims." Retrieved July 8, 2017 (https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/wysk/enforcement_protections_lgbt_workers.cfm #examples).
- Waldfogel, Jane. 1997. "The Effect of Children on Women's Wages." *American Sociological Review* 62(2): 209-217.
- Waldfogel, Jane. 1998. "Understanding the" Family Gap" in Pay for Women with Children." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12(1): 137-156.
- Waldner, Lisa K., and Brian Magruder. 1999. "Coming Out to Parents: Perceptions of Family Relations, Perceived Resources, and Identity Expression as Predictors of Identity
 Disclosure for Gay and Lesbian Adolescents. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 37(2): 83-100.
- Waldo, Craig R. 1999. "Working in a Majority Context: A Structural Model of Heterosexism as Minority Stress in the Workplace." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 46(2): 218-232

- Weichselbaumner, Doris. 2001. "Sexual Orientation Discrimination in Hiring." Johannes Kepler University of Linz Department of Economics Working Paper No. 0021. Retrieved July 16, 2017 (https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/73263/1/wp0021.pdf).
- Wells, Joel W., and William B. Kline. 1987. "Self-disclosure of homosexual orientation." *The Journal of social psychology* 127(2): 191-197.

Wienke, Chris and Rachel B. Whaley. 2017. "(How) Does the Proportion of Same-sex Couples in Neighborhoods Impact the Mental Health of Sexual Minority Young Adults?" in *Sexual Orientation: Perceptions, Discrimination, and Acceptance* (pp. 81-108). Nova Science Publishers.

Yamokoski, Alexis, and Lisa A. Keister. 2006. "The Wealth of Single Women: Marital Status and Parenthood in the Asset Accumulation of Young Baby Boomers in the United States." *Feminist Economics* 12(1-2): 167-194.

	(11 123)	Out	Not Out	Out	Not Out
	Full	Men	Men	Women	Women
Variables	Sample	(n=96)	(n=67)	(n=137)	(n=125)
	Ν	n	n	n	n
Coming Out					
Not out to either parent	192		67		125
Out to either parent	233	96		137	
Sexual Orientation Identity (W3)					
Bisexual	220	7	31	70	112
Mostly/100% homosexual	205	89	36	67	13
Race/Ethnicity					
Non-Hispanic white	239	51	32	83	73
Other	186	45	35	54	52
Gender					
Male	163	96	67		
Female	262			137	125
Context Variables					
Concentration same-sex households (tract)					
Low	139	30	27	40	42
Medium	142	30	18	48	46
High	144	36	22	49	37
Control Variables					
Living with Two Biological Parents (W1)	211	44	37	63	67
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)					
Same census tract	120	25	23	44	28
Moved to different tract within county	196	40	24	64	68
Moved to different county	109	31	20	29	29
Region (W1)					
West	117	25	19	41	32
Midwest	114	23	11	42	38
Northeast	54	12	8	19	15
South (ref)	140	36	29	35	40
Living with Parent (W3)	148	32	25	52	39

APPENDIX A: SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES FOR CHAPTER II

Table A2.1. Sample Sizes for Out to Either Parent (N=425)

	Zero Order		Full Model	
Same-Sex Coresidential Union	11.591	***	9.711	***
Bisexual (ref = Homosexual)	0.189	***	0.105	***
Female	0.755		1.961	t
Proportion Same-Sex Couples				'
(Tract)				
Low Concentration (ref)				
Medium Concentration	1.815	Ť	3.052	**
High Concentration	1.688		2.354	*
Controls				
White	1.281		2.034	ŧ
Age at Wave III	1.182	*	1.034	'
Living with Two Biological				
Parents	0.762		0.609	
Family SES	1.056		1.049	
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)				
Same census tract (ref)				
Moved to different tract				
within county	0.685		0.575	Ť
Moved to different county	0.818		0.584	
Region (W1)				
South (ref)				
West	0.748		0.974	
Midwest	1.493		2.366	*
Northeast	1.758		2.333	ŧ
Live with Parents	1.052		1.390	
Parental Closeness	0.804	ť	0.900	
Religiosity	1.098	-	1.124	

Table A2.2 Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Fither Parent (N=425)

Notes: Survey-adjusted models. † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; ***

p<.001

Table A2.3. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Out to Either Parent by Gender									
	Men	(n=163)	Women (n	=262)					
	Zero Order	Model 2	Zero Order	Model 2					
Same-Sex Coresidential Union	5.601 *	9.893 *	24.421 ***	11.130 *					
Bisexual (ref = Homosexual)	0.167 **	0.114 **	0.116 ***	0.102 ***					
Proportion Same-Sex Couples (Tract)									
Low Concentration (ref)									
Medium Concentration	1.957	3.663 *	1.871	2.265 †					
High Concentration	1.443	2.205	1.930	1.856					
Controls									
White	1.347	2.477	1.337	2.016					
Age at Wave III	1.177	1.100	1.175 †	1.048					
Living with Two Biological Parents	1.053	0.716	0.616	0.582					
Family SES	0.992	1.007	1.101	1.078					
Geographic Mobility (W1 & W3)									
Same census tract (ref)									
Moved to different tract within county	1.152	0.767	0.500 †	0.456 †					
Moved to different county	1.556	1.091	0.481 †	0.377 †					
Region (W1)									
South (ref)									
West	0.982	1.019	0.635	0.908					
Midwest	2.010	3.063	1.323	2.026					
Northeast	2.142	2.621	1.547	2.127					
Live with Parents	1.016	1.000	1.070	1.593					
Parental Closeness	0.548 †	0.676	0.956	1.007					
Religiosity	1.236 †	1.256	0.996	1.015					

Table A5.1. Descriptive Statutes Comparing Union Form	Men		Women		
	Wien	Sexual	women		
		Minorities Who		Sexual	
		Did Not Form		Minorities Who	
	Formed Same-	Same-Sex	Formed Same-	Did Not Form	
	Sex Union	Union Prior to	Sex Union	Same-Sex Union	
	Prior to Wave	Wave	Prior to Wave	Prior to Wave	
Variable	III (n=36)	III(n=119)	III (n=83)	III(n=183)	
	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	%/Mean	
Same-Sex Union Formation	100.00	31.66	100.00	10 77	
	100.00	51.00	100.00	10.77	
Sexual Identity (W3)					
100% heterosexual	22.95	_	28.65	-	
Mostly heterosexual	0.00	_	8.08	-	
Bisexual	0.00	28.91	29.57	76.62	
Mostly homosexual	4.03	30.86	13.62	15.73	
100% homosexual	70.82	40.23	20.08	7.65	
Context Variables					
Out to either parent	65.56	55.51	51.49	45.80	
Proportion voting Republican (county)	0.51	0.45	0.51	0.47	
Concentration same-sex households (tract)					
Low	46.53	37.26	23.64	35.84	
Medium	37.89	32.18	43.58	37.85	
High	15.57	30.55	32.77	26.31	
Control Variables					
Age at Wave III	22.81	22.20	22.37	21.88	
Race/Ethnicity					
Non-Hispanic white	59.08	65.98	73.54	78.25	
Non-Hispanic black	11.27	13.35	16.99	7.34	
Hispanic	13.40	14.37	8.51	11.99	
Non-Hispanic other	16.25	6.30	0.96	2.42	
Two biological parents (W1)	57.83	47.32	44.04	53.95	
Family SES (1-10)	4.19	5.68	5.34	5.27	
Migrate (more than 50 miles)	24.43	35.86	20.82	25.91	

APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES FOR CHAPTER III

Table A3.1. Descriptive Statitics Comparing Union Formation Samples

Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001 (two-tailed tests between respondents who did and did not form a same-sex union prior to Wave III)

	Men			Women			
Variable	All Men (n=5,414)	Heterosexual (n=5,266)	Sexual Minority (n=119)	All Women (n=6,382)	Heterosexual (n=6,161)	Sexual Minority (n=183)	
	n	n	n	n	n	n	
Same-Sex Union Formation	66	5 28	38	84	56	28	
Sexual Identity (W3)							
100% heterosexual	5,121	5,097	_	5,545	5,509	-	
Mostly heterosexual	173	169	_	653	652	-	
Bisexual	33	_	32	146	_	145	
Mostly homosexual	37	_	37	23	_	23	
100% homosexual	50	_	50	15	_	15	
Context Variables							
Out to either parent	62	_	62	82	_	82	
Concentration same-sex households (tract)							
Low	1,966	1,909	40	2,454	2,383	61	
Medium	2,193	2,146	38	2,291	2,212	60	
High	3,051	1,211	41	1,637	1,566	62	
Control Variables							
Race/Ethnicity							
Non-Hispanic white	3,051	2,984	58	3,350	3,429	110	
Non-Hispanic black	984	954	20	1,407	1,356	33	
Hispanic	891	853	29	949	911	31	
Non-Hispanic other	488	475	12	476	465	9	
Two biological parents (W1)	3,174	3,108	56	3,557	3,445	97	
Migrate (more than 50 miles)	1,437	1,391	42	1,604	1,548	49	

Table A3.2. Sample Sizes for Same-Sex Union Formation (N=11,728)

 Migrate (more than 50 miles)
 1,437
 1,391
 42

 Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001 (two-tailed tests between heterosexual and sexual minority respondents)</td>

	Men (N=558	82)			Women (N=6537)			
Variable	Zero Order	I	Full Mode	el	Zero Order		Full Mod	el
Sexual Identity (W4)								
100%/mostly heterosexual	1.121		0.909		1.648	*	1.643	*
Bisexual (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Mostly/100% homosexual	1.290		1.543		2.331	*	1.596	
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	1.031		0.987		0.995		1.028	
Education								
Less than High School (ref)	-		-		-		-	
High School	1.500		1.588	ţ	1.396	*	1.445	*
Some College	2.133	***	2.627	* * *	2.819	***	3.225	***
College	2.885	***	3.617	***	4.935	***	4.659	***
Graduate Degree	2.269	**	3.111	***	4.436	***	4.064	***
Region (W4)								
Northeast (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Midwest	1.038		1.079		1.017		1.235	
South	1.112		1.255		0.820		0.975	
West	1.119		1.147		1.118		1.073	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Non-Hispanic Black	0.512	***	0.573	***	1.128		1.358	*
Hispanic	1.044		1.213		1.284	*	1.673	***
Other	0.748		0.810		0.956		0.867	
Current Student (W4)	0.429	***	0.343	* * *	0.876		0.607	***
Child in Household (W4)	1.719	***	1.163		0.380	***	0.465	***
Union Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.570	**	0.695	*	1.446	**	1.456	**
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.382	†	0.228		1.816	Ť	1.434	
Not Married/Cohabiting	0.375	***	0.454	***	1.484	***	1.301	*

APPENDIX C: SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES FOR CHAPTER IV

 Table A4.1. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Employment by Identity N=(12119)

Notes: Survey-adjusted models.

	Men (N=5582)				Women (N=6537)			
Variable	Zero-Order		Full Mode	el	Zero-Order	F	ull Mod	el
Couple Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married	0.306		1.203		0.573		0.745	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.740		0.835		0.828		1.074	
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.503		0.426		1.040		0.927	
No Coresidential - Heterosexual	0.481	Ť	0.554		0.887		0.994	
No Coresidential - Bisexual	0.879		0.995		0.281	*	0.400	Ť
No Coresidential - Homosexual (ref)								
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	1.031		0.987		0.995		1.028	
Education								
Less than High School (ref)	-							
High School	1.500		1.580	Ť	1.396	*	1.454	*
Some College	2.133	***	2.619	* * *	2.819	***	3.240	***
College	2.885	***	3.622	* * *	4.935	***	4.687	***
Graduate Degree	2.269	**	3.106	* * *	4.436	***	4.085	***
Region (W4)								
Northeast (ref)	-							
Midwest	1.038		1.074		1.017		1.243	
South	1.112		1.252		0.820		0.979	
West	1.119		1.145		1.118		1.078	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-							
Non-Hispanic Black	0.512	***	0.571	* * *	1.128		1.358	*
Hispanic	1.044		1.209		1.284	*	1.682	* * *
Other	0.748		0.810		0.956		0.874	
Current Student (W4)	0.429	***	0.343	* * *	0.876		0.608	
Child in Household (W4)	1.719	***	1.178		0.380	***	0.469	***

 Table A4.2. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Employment N=(12119)

	Men (N=	Women (N=6537)						
Variable	Zero Orde	er	Full Mode	el	Zero Order	F	Full Model	
Sexual Identity (W4)								
100%/mostly heterosexual								
Bisexual	0.436	*	0.503	*	0.599	*	0.653	t
Mostly/100% homosexual	0.897		1.408		1.237		1.288	
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	1.066	*	1.015		0.966	†	0.987	
Education								
Less than High School (ref)	-		-		-		-	
High School	1.522	*	1.630	*	1.426	*	1.447	*
Some College	1.722	***	2.197	* * *	2.071	***	2.395	***
College	2.064	***	2.670	* * *	3.951	***	3.686	***
Graduate Degree	1.789	**	2.512	* * *	4.781	***	4.528	***
Region (W4)								
Northeast (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Midwest	1.308		1.461		0.992		1.159	
South	1.473	*	1.727	* *	1.053		1.238	
West	1.345		1.467	Ť	1.143		1.059	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Non-Hispanic Black	0.565	***	0.581	* * *	1.194	†	1.477	***
Hispanic	1.187		1.420	Ť	1.183		1.494	**
Other	0.801		0.999		0.951		0.932	
Current Student (W4)	0.325	***	0.280	* * *	0.664	***	0.504	***
Child in Household (W4)	1.847	***	1.159		0.409	* * *	0.461	***
Union Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.544	***	0.643	**	1.278	**	1.241	*
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.312	**	0.222	**	0.957		0.609	
Not Married/Cohabiting	0.363	***	0.436	* * *	1.239	*	1.021	

Table A4.3. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Full Time Employment by Identity (N=12,119)

	Men (N=5	5582)			Women (N=6537)			
Variable	Zero Orde	er	Full Model		Zero Order		Full Model	
Sexual Identity (W4)								
100%/mostly heterosexual	2.293	*	1.989	*	1.670	*	1.530	t
Bisexual (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Mostly/100% homosexual	2.056	t	2.802	*	2.066	*	1.970	t
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	1.066	*	1.015		0.966	t	0.987	
Education								
Less than High School (ref)	-		-		-		-	
High School	1.522	*	1.630	*	1.426	*	1.447	*
Some College	1.722	***	2.197	* * *	2.071	***	2.395	***
College	2.064	***	2.670	* * *	3.951	***	3.686	***
Graduate Degree	1.789	**	2.512	* * *	4.781	***	4.528	***
Region (W4)								
Northeast (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Midwest	1.308		1.461		0.992		1.159	
South	1.473	*	1.727	**	1.053		1.238	
West	1.345		1.467	Ť	1.143		1.059	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Non-Hispanic Black	0.565	***	0.581	* * *	1.194	t	1.477	***
Hispanic	1.187		1.420	Ť	1.183		1.494	**
Other	0.801		0.999		0.951		0.932	
Current Student (W4)	0.325	***	0.280	* * *	0.664	***	0.504	***
Child in Household (W4)	1.847	***	1.159		0.409	***	0.461	***
Union Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married (ref)	-		-		-		-	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.544	***	0.643	**	1.278	**	1.241	*
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.312	**	0.222	**	0.957		0.609	
Not Married/Cohabiting	0.363	***	0.436	* * *	1.239	*	1.021	

Table A4.4. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Full-Time Employment by Identity N=(12119)

	Men (N=5,		Women (N=6,537)					
Variable	Zero-Order		Full Mode	el	Zero-Order		Full Mode	el
Couple Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married (ref)								
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.544	***	0.643	**	1.278	**	1.230	*
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.312	**	0.296	*	0.957		0.662	
No Coresidential - Heterosexual	0.360	***	0.438	***	1.264	*	1.034	
No Coresidential - Bisexual	0.289	**	0.310	**	0.489	*	0.514	*
No Coresidential - Homosexual	0.475	**	0.516	*	1.760		1.363	
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	1.066	*	1.016		0.966	t	0.987	
Education								
Less than High School (ref)	-				-			
High School	1.522	*	1.637	*	1.426	*	1.459	*
Some College	1.722	***	2.210	* * *	2.071	***	2.410	***
College	2.064	***	2.693	* * *	3.951	***	3.713	***
Graduate Degree	1.789	**	2.536	* * *	4.781	***	4.554	***
Region (W4)								
Northeast (ref)	-		-		-			
Midwest	1.308		1.460	t	0.992		1.162	
South	1.473	*	1.730	**	1.053		1.241	
West	1.345		1.467	Ť	1.143		1.060	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-		-		-			
Non-Hispanic Black	0.565	***	0.581	***	1.194	t	1.479	***
Hispanic	1.187		1.422	Ť	1.183		1.501	**
Other	0.801		1.002		0.951		0.936	
Current Student (W4)	0.325	***	0.280	* * *	0.664	***	0.506	***
Child in Household (W4)	1.847	***	1.171		0.409	***	0.463	***

 Table A4.5. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Full Time Employment by Couple Type (N=12,119)

	Men (N=5,585)				Women (N=6,537)			
Variable	Zero-Orde	r	Full Mode	el	Zero-Order		Full Mode	el
Couple Type (W4)								
Different-Sex Married	1.764	*	1.586		0.571		0.736	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.916		1.024		0.730		0.905	
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.535		0.461		0.547		0.487	
No Coresidential - Heterosexual	0.639	Ť	0.705		0.722		0.761	
No Coresidential - Bisexual	0.514		0.499		0.280	**	0.378	Ť
No Coresidential - Homosexual (ref)								
Control Variables								
Age at Wave IV	1.066	*	1.016		0.966	t	0.987	
Education								
Less than High School (ref)	-				-			
High School	1.522	*	1.637	*	1.426	*	1.459	*
Some College	1.722	***	2.210	* * *	2.071	***	2.410	***
College	2.064	***	2.693	* * *	3.951	***	3.713	***
Graduate Degree	1.789	**	2.536	* * *	4.781	***	4.554	***
Region (W4)								
Northeast (ref)	-		-		-			
Midwest	1.308		1.460	Ť	0.992		1.162	
South	1.473	*	1.730	**	1.053		1.241	
West	1.345		1.467	Ť	1.143		1.060	
Race/Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-		-		-			
Non-Hispanic Black	0.565	***	0.581	* * *	1.194	t	1.479	***
Hispanic	1.187		1.422	Ť	1.183		1.501	**
Other	0.801		1.002		0.951		0.936	
Current Student (W4)	0.325	***	0.280	* * *	0.664	***	0.506	***
Child in Household (W4)	1.847	***	1.171		0.409	***	0.463	***

 Table A4.6. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Full-Time Employment N=(12,119)

Table A4.7. OLS Regressions for Log Hourly Wages: Identity N=(9,287)

U	Men (N=4,611)		Women (N=4,676)	
Variable	Zero-Order Fu	ıll Model	Zero-Order Fu	ıll Model
Sexual Identity (W4)				
100%/mostly heterosexual (ref)	0.370 *	0.285 †	0.251 *	0.169 †
Bisexual (ref)				
Mostly/100% homosexual	0.417 **	0.237	0.211 †	0.068
Control Variables				
Age at Wave IV	0.043 ***	0.027 **	0.033 **	0.039 ***
Education				
Less than High School (ref)				
High School	0.180 **	0.174 **	0.210 **	0.151 †
Some College	0.420 ***	0.376 ***	0.438 ***	0.346 ***
College	0.659 ***	0.546 ***	0.851 ***	0.615 ***
Graduate Degree	0.681 ***	0.518 ***	0.979 ***	0.681 ***
Region (W4)				
Northeast (ref)				
Midwest	-0.036	-0.007	-0.157 †	-0.120 *
South	-0.125 *	-0.063	-0.179 *	-0.106 †
West	0.009	0.022	0.118	0.058
Race/Ethnicity				
Non-Hispanic White (ref)				
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.277 ***	-0.179 ***	-0.178 **	-0.050
Hispanic	-0.077 †	-0.009	-0.074	0.007
Other	0.100 †	0.066	0.194 *	0.174 *
Current Student (W4)	-0.016	-0.084 †	0.061 †	0.016
Child in Household (W4)	0.106 **	0.048	-0.295 ***	-0.173 ***
Part-Time Work	0.001	-0.002	0.004	-0.003
Occupational Category				
Managers (ref)				
Professionals	0.057	0.004	0.084 *	-0.036
Technicians	-0.004	0.012	-0.040	-0.003
Sales	-0.282 ***	-0.232 ***	-0.353 ***	-0.271 ***
Administrative Support	-0.396 ***	-0.299 **	-0.202 ***	-0.118 *
Craft	-0.217 ***	-0.091 *	-0.166	0.026
Operatives	-0.341 ***	-0.188 **	-0.581 ***	-0.400 *
Laborers	-0.549 ***	-0.334 ***	-0.419 ***	-0.244 *
Service	-0.376 ***	-0.255 ***	-0.476 ***	-0.348 ***
Military	0.402 **	0.354 *	0.455 ***	0.424 ***
Union Type				
Different-Sex Married (ref)				
Different-Sex Cohabiting	-0.263 ***	-0.164 ***	-0.078 †	-0.006
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.149	0.050	-0.023	0.139
Not Married/Cohabiting	-0.307 ***	-0.221 ***	-0.114 **	-0.093 *

Table A4.8. OLS Regressions for Log Hourly Wages: By Couple Type N=(9,287)

	Men (N=4,611)			Women (N=4,676)			
Variable	Zero Order	Full Model		Zero Order	Full Mode	ull Model	
Couple Type (W4)							
Different-Sex Married	0.226 *	0.275	* *	0.055	0.085	5	
Different-Sex Cohabiting	-0.039	0.107		-0.023	0.075	5	
Same-Sex Coresidential	0.362 *	0.264		0.032	0.109)	
No Coresidential - Heterosexual	-0.084	0.049		-0.053	-0.009)	
No Coresidential - Bisexual	-0.397 *	-0.265		-0.350 †	-0.175	5	
No Coresidential - Homosexual (ref)						_	
Control Variables							
Age at Wave IV	0.043 ***	0.027	* *	0.033 **	* 0.039	***	
Education							
Less than High School (ref)							
High School	0.180 **	0.176	* *	0.210 **	* 0.150	†	
Some College	0.420 ***	0.378	* * *	0.438 **	** 0.347	***	
College	0.659 ***	0.548	* * *	0.851 **	** 0.616	***	
Graduate Degree	0.681 ***	0.521	* * *	0.979 **	** 0.683	***	
Region (W4)							
Northeast (ref)							
Midwest	-0.036	-0.007		-0.157 †	-0.120	*	
South	-0.125 *	-0.063		-0.179 *	-0.106	†	
West	0.009	0.023		0.118	0.059		
Race/Ethnicity							
Non-Hispanic White (ref)							
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.277 ***	-0.176	* * *	-0.178 **	* -0.049		
Hispanic	-0.077 †	-0.008		-0.074	0.008		
Other	0.100 †	0.067		0.194 *	0.174	*	
Current Student (W4)	-0.016	-0.084	t	0.061 †	0.016		
Child in Household (W4)	0.106 **	0.046		-0.295 **	** -0.172	***	
Part-Time Work	0.001	-0.002		0.004	-0.003		
Occupational Category							
Managers (ref)							
Professionals	0.057	0.003		0.084 *	-0.038		
Technicians	-0.004	0.013		-0.040	-0.002		
Sales	-0.282 ***	-0.231	***	-0.353 **	** -0.274	***	
Administrative Support	-0.396 ***	-0.299	* *	-0.202 **	** -0.118	*	
Craft	-0.217 ***	-0.089	†	-0.166	0.030		
Operatives	-0.341 ***	-0.186	**	-0.581 **	** -0.401	*	
Laborers	-0.549 ***	-0.334	***	-0.419 **	** -0.258	**	
Service	-0.376 ***	-0.253	***	-0.476 **	** -0.349	***	
Military	0.402 **	0.358	*	0.455 **	** 0.425	***	

	Full Sample	_	Men (N=5,582	2)	Women (N=6,537)		
Variable		Heterosexual Men (n=5389)	Bisexual Men (n=40)	Homosexual Men (n=153)	Heteros exual Women (n=6253)	Bisexual Women (n=160)	Homosexual Women (n=124)
	Ν	n	n	n	n	n	n
Working 10 Hours Per Week (W4)	9,542	4,573	33	134	4,607	100	95
Sexual Identity (W4)							
100%/mostly heterosexual	11,642	5,389			6,253		
Bisexual	200		40			160	
Mostly/100% homosexual	277			153			124
Couple Type (W4)							
Different-Sex Married	4,809	2,037	3	0	2,732	32	5
Different-Sex Cohabiting	2,202	1,005	7	1	1,144	41	4
Same-Sex Coresidential	112	4	1	41	2	12	52
Heterosexual Single	4,718	2,343			2,375		
Bisexual Single	104		29			75	
Homos exual Single	174			111			63
Control Variables							
Education							
Less than High School	980	536	7	6	401	23	7
High School	1,964	1,038	5	17	858	25	21
Some College	5,442	2,372	17	66	2,843	79	65
College	2,760	1,127	9	43	1,529	25	27
Graduate Degree	973	316	2	21	622	8	4
Region (W4)							
Northeast	2,813	1,271	9	35	1,427	39	32
Midwest	3,122	1,393	14	34	1,595	50	36
South	4,609	2,035	11	63	2,408	47	45
West	1,575	690	6	21	823	24	11
Race/Ethnicity							
Non-Hispanic White	6,752	3,030	23	78	3,476	85	60
Non-Hispanic Black	2,618	1,091	9	24	1,424	36	34
Hispanic	1,848	830	7	34	928	27	22
Other	894	437	1	16	421	11	8
Current Student (W4)	2,050	716	5	30	1,243	20	36
Child in Household (W4)	5,782	1,963	8	3	3,702	81	25
Union Type (W4)							
Different-Sex Married	4,809	2,037	3	0	2,732	32	5
Different-Sex Cohabiting	2,202	1,005	7	1	1,144	41	4
Same-Sex Coresidential	112	4	1	41	2	12	52
No Coresidential	4 996	2 343	29	111	2 375	75	63

Table A4.9. Sample Sizes for Employment (N=12,119)

Table A4.10. Descriptive Statistics for Wages (N=9,289)

Variable	Full Sample		Men (N=4792)	Women (N=4848)		
		Heterosexual Men (n=4448)	Bisexual Men (n=32)	Homosexual Men (n=133)	Heterosexual Women (n=4487)	Bisexual Women (n=98)	Homosexual Women (n=91)
	Ν	n	n	n	n	n	n
Sexual Identity (W4)							
100%/mostly heterosexual	8,935	4,448			4,487		
Bisexual	130		32			98	
Mostly/100% homosexual	224			133			91
Couple Type (W4)							
Different-Sex Married	3,691	1,839	2		1,831	16	3
Different-Sex Cohabiting	1,708	821	6	1	847	30	3
Same-Sex Coresidential	90	2		36	1	8	43
Heterosexual Single	3,594	1,786	24		1,808		-
Bisexual Single	68					44	-
Homosexual Single	138			96			42
Control Variables							
Education							
Less than High School	582	375	5	6	185	10	1
High School	1,370	823	3	15	503	11	15
Some College	4,218	1,984	15	57	2,062	50	50
College	2,308	992	7	37	1,230	19	23
Graduate Degree	811	274	2	18	507	8	2
Region (W4)							
Northeast	2,198	1,043	7	31	1,071	21	25
Midwest	2,427	1,158	11	28	1,171	32	27
South	3,424	1,676	9	55	1,623	30	31
West	1,240	571	5	19	622	15	8
Race/Ethnicity							
Non-Hispanic White	5,181	2,569	20	66	2,426	53	47
Non-Hispanic Black	1,919	802	7	20	1,043	25	22
Hispanic	1,488	717	5	32	706	13	15
Other	696	359	0	15	308	7	7
Current Student (W4)	1,466	517	3	24	887	12	23
Child in Household (W4)	4,160	1,709	8	3	2,384	42	14
Occupational Category							
Managers	707	344	2	21	327	3	10
Professionals	2,600	1,023	6	63	1,458	30	20
Technicians	340	86	2	3	243	2	4
Sales	925	455	4	9	428	13	16
Administrative Support	938	159	0	11	745	11	12
Craft	845	806	4	1	33	0	1
Operatives	702	557	3	5	126	5	6
Laborers	393	329	4	2	51	3	4
Service	1,826	680	6	18	1,073	31	18
Military	13	9	1	0	3	0	0
Union Type							
Different-Sex Married	3,691	1,839	2	0	1,831	16	3
Different-Sex Cohabiting	g 1,708	821	6	1	847	30	3
Same-Sex Coresidential	90	2	0	36	1	8	43
Not Married/Cohabiting	3,800	1.786	24	96	1.808	44	42