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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Using data from Census 2000, this report provides demographic and socio-economic information about Latino/as in same-sex couples in California. In this report, the category "Latino/a couples" means couples where both members are Latino/a; "inter-ethnic couples" means couples where only one member is a Latino/a; and "Non-Latino/a couples" indicates couples where neither member is a Latino/a.

## LATINOIAS IN SAME-SEX COUPLES IN CALIFORNIA

- In California, approximately 45,000 Latino/as identified themselves as living with a same-sex partner in Census 2000.
- Stated differently, one-fourth of the individuals in same-sex couples in California are Latino/a and one-third of California's same-sex couples include at least one Latino/a (due to inter-ethnic couples).
- There are more Latino/as in same-sex couples in California than in any other state; over $30 \%$ of the 147,000 Latino/as in same-sex couples identified in the U.S. live in California.
- Census 2000 identified Latino/a members of same-sex couples in all but two California counties (Alpine and Trinity), but almost one-fifth of such couples live in Los Angeles County.
- In California, inter-ethnic and Latino/a same-sex couples are much more likely to live in counties with high percentages of Latino/as in the population as opposed to counties with high percentages of same-sex couples in the population.
- Approximately three-quarters of Latino/as in same-sex couples are of Mexican origin, which corresponds with the proportion of persons of Mexican origin among all Latino/as in California. Significant percentages of Latino/as in same-sex couples are also of Salvadoran, Puerto Rican, Guatemalan, Cuban, and Nicaraguan origin.
- In terms of their demographics and socio-economic status, Latino/as in same-sex couples look much more similar to Latino/as in different-sex couples than Non-Latino/as in same-sex couples. They differ little from Latino/as in different-sex couples in terms of age, disability, citizenship, military status, rates of public assistance, rates of employment, and employment patterns.
- Latino/as in same-sex couples differ from their different-sex counterparts in that they are less likely to speak a non-English language, have higher average incomes, and are more likely to have a college degree.
- Compared with Non-Latino/as in same-sex couples in California, Latino/as in same-sex couples are much less likely to have a college degree ( $13 \%$ v. $46 \%$ ), be employed ( $61 \% \mathrm{v} .74 \%$ ), and be U.S. citizens ( $58 \% \mathrm{v}$. 94\%). On average, they have annual individual incomes that are over $\$ 24,000$ less than Non-Latino/as in same-sex couples.
- Thirty-seven percent of Latino/as in same-sex couples in California are in inter-ethnic couples. When Latino/a same-sex couples (those where both partners are Latino/a) are analyzed separately, their socio-economic situation is much worse off than Non-Latino/a same-sex couples and worse off than inter-ethnic same-sex couples. For example, compared with Non-Latino/a same-sex couples, Latino/a same-sex couples have much lower rates of employment ( $61 \% \mathrm{v} .74 \%$ ) and having a college degree ( $13 \% \mathrm{v} .46 \%$ ).
- In California, the average household income of Latino/a same-sex couples is about half of that of nonLatino/a same-sex couples ( $\$ 51,251 \mathrm{v}$. $\$ 100,297$ ). Their average household incomes are similar to those of Latino/a different-sex couples $(\$ 49,243)$.


## LATINOIA SAME-SEX PARENTS IN CALIFORNIA, AGED 25-55

In analyzing Latino/a same-sex parents in California, we looked at the population aged 25-55 since this is the group most likely to be raising children.

- Almost $70 \%$ of Latino/a same-sex couples aged 25-55 are raising their own children in California. Although this percentage may be high due to measurement error in the Census, even when adjusting for such error it is still probable that over half of these couples are raising their own children.
- Latino/a same-sex couples are much more likely to be raising their own children than both inter-ethnic same-sex couples (24\%) and non-Latino/a same-sex couples (24\%). Furthermore, they are even more likely to be raising their own children than non-Latino/a different-sex couples (60\%).
- Inter- and intra-ethnic Latino/a same-sex couples (i.e. same-sex couples with one or more Latino/a partner) in California are raising more than 30,000 of their own children and 36,000 children under 18 (related and unrelated children).
- There are more than 33,000 Latino/a children being raised by same-sex couples in California. Eightyeight percent are being raised by two Latino/a parents and $98 \%$ have at least one Latino/a parent.
- Latino/a same-sex parents are raising their children with substantially fewer resources than nonLatino/a parents in California. A comparison of intra-ethnic same-sex Latino/a parents with nonLatino/a different-sex parents in California illustrates this point. Latino/a same-sex parents are much less likely to have a college education and own a home, and have much lower household incomes. For these characteristics, Latino/a same-sex parents look similar to Latino/a different-sex parents in California.
- While $39 \%$ of non-Latino/a parents in different-sex couples in California have college degrees, only $5 \%$ of parents who are part of a Latino/a same-sex couple do. While $70 \%$ of non-Latino/a parents in different-sex couples in California own a home, only $40 \%$ of parents in Latino/a same-sex couples do.
- Parents in Latino/a same-sex couples have annual household incomes that are, on average, almost $\$ 50,000$ less than non-Latino/a parents in different-sex couples in California.

Data from Census 2000 demonstrate that there is a large number of Latino/a same-sex couples and families with children in California and that without the support and protections provided by marriage, they are more vulnerable than other California families.

## RESUMEN EJECUTIVO

Usando datos del censo 2000, este informe proporciona la información demográfica y socioeconómica sobre latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo en California. En este informe, la categoría "parejas latinas" significa parejas donde ambos miembros son latinos; "parejas interétnicas" donde solamente un miembro es latino(a); y "parejas no latinas" indica a las parejas donde ninguno de los dos miembros es latino(a).

## LATINOS(AS) EN PAREJAS DEL MISMO SEX EN CALIFORNIA

- En California, aproximadamente 45,000 latinos(as) indicaron que viven con un pareja del mismo sexo en el censo 2000.
- Dicho de otra manera, un cuarto de los individuos en parejas del mismo sexo en California son latinos(as) y un tercio de parejas del mismo sexo en California incluyen por lo menos un(a) latino(a) (debido a parejas interétnicas).
- Hay más latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo en California que en cualquier otro estado, más de $30 \%$ de los/las 147,000 latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo en EEUU viven en California.
- En el censo 2000, se identifico que hay latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo en todos los condados de California, excepto dos (Alpestres y Trinidad), pero casi un quinto de tales parejas viven en el condado de Los Ángeles.
- En California, es mucho más probable encontrar parejas interétnicas o latinas del mismo sexo en condados con altos porcentajes de latinos(as) en la población en comparación con condados con altos porcentajes de parejas del mismo sexo en la población.
- Aproximadamente tres cuartos de latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo son de origen mexicano, que corresponde con la proporción de personas del origen mexicano entre todos latinos(as) en California. También, porcentajes significativos de latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo son de origen salvadoreño, puertorriqueño, guatemalteco, cubano, y nicaragüense.
- En lo que se refiere a sus características demográficas y estado socioeconómico, parejas latinas del mismo sexo parecen mucho más similar a parejas latinas de sexos diferentes que a parejas no latinas del mismo sexo. Son similares a parejas latinas de sexos diferentes en lo que se refiere a edad, incapacidad, ciudadanía, estado militar, uso de asistencia pública, cifras de empleo, y pautas de empleo.
- Latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo son diferentes a parejas latinas de sexos diferentes en que es menos probable que hablen un lenguaje que no sea ingles, que tengan ingresos promedios más altos, y es más probable que tengan un titulo universitario.
- Comparando con parejas no latinas del mismo sexo en California, es menos probable que latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo tengan un titulo universitario ( $13 \% \mathrm{v} .46 \%$ ), que tengan empleo ( $61 \% \mathrm{v} .74 \%$ ), y sean ciudadanos estadounidenses ( $58 \% \mathrm{v} .94 \%$ ). En promedio, tienen ingresos individuales anuales que son aproximadamente $\$ 24,000$ menos que personas no latinas en parejas del mismo sexo.
- Treinta y siete por ciento de latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo en California son parte de parejas interétnicas. Cuando parejas latinas del mismo sexo (donde las dos personas son latinos/as) se analizan separadamente, su situación socioeconómica es mucho más peor que parejas no latinas del mismo sexo y peor que parejas interétnicas del mismo sexo. Por ejemplo, comparadas con parejas no latinas del mismo sexo, parejas latinas del mismo sexo tienen bajos niveles de empleo ( $61 \%$ v. $74 \%$ ) y de obtener títulos universitarios ( $13 \% \mathrm{v} .46 \%$ ).
- En California, el promedio del ingreso domestico de parejas latinas del mismo sexo es aproximadamente la mitad del promedio del ingreso familiar de parejas no latinas del mismo sexo (\$51,251 v. \$100,297). Sus ingresos familiares son similares a los ingresos de parejas latinas de sexos diferentes (\$49,243).


## PADRES/MADRES LATINOS(AS) DEL MISMO SEXO EN CALIFORNIA, ENTRE 22-55 AÑOS

Para analizar a padres/madres latinos(as) del mismo sexo en California, miramos a la población entre 22-55 años de edad porque es muy probable que este grupo este criando a niños.

- Más de $70 \%$ de parejas latinas del mismo sexo, entre 22-55 años de edad, están criando a sus propios niños en California. Es más probable que parejas latinas del mismo sexo estén criando a sus propios niños que ambas parejas interétnicas del mismo sexo (25\%) y parejas no latinas del mismo sexo (24\%). Además, es más probable que estén criando a sus propios niños que parejas no latinas de sexos diferentes (60\%).
- Parejas interétnicas y latinas del mismo sexo en California están criando más de 30,000 de sus propios niños y 36,000 niños con menos de 18 años de edad (niños con y sin lazos sanguíneos).
- Hay más de 33,000 niños latinos que son criados por parejas del mismo sexo en California. Ochenta por ciento de ellos son criados por dos padres/madres latinos(as) y 98\% tienen por lo menos un padre/madre latino(a).
- Padres/madres latinos(as) del mismo sexo están criando a sus niños con sustancialmente menos recursos que padres/madres no latinos(as) en California. Una comparación de padres/madres latinos(as) del mismo sexo con padres/madres no latinos(as) de sexos diferentes en California ilustra este punto. Es menos probable que padres/madres latinos(as) del mismo sexo tengan una educación universitaria y posean una casa, y también tienen ingresos anuales domésticos mucho más bajos. Con estas características, padres/madres latinos(as) del mismo sexo son similares a los padres/madres latinos(as) de sexos diferentes en California.
- Mientras que el $39 \%$ de padres/madres no latinos de sexos diferentes en California tienen títulos universitarios, solamente $5 \%$ de padres/madres que son parte una pareja latina del mismo sexo tienen lo mismo. Mientras que el 70\% de padres/madres no latinos(as) de sexos diferentes en California tienen su propia casa, solamente el 42\% de padres/madres latinos(as) del mismo sexo poseen una casa.
- Padres/madres latinos(as) en parejas del mismo sexo tienen ingresos anuales que, en promedio, son casi \$50,000 menos que padres/madres no latinos(as) en parejas de sexos diferentes en California.

Los datos del censo 2000 demuestran que hay son una gran cantidad de parejas latinas del mismo sexo y familias con niños en California y que se beneficiarían de la ayuda y las protecciones que el matrimonio proporciona.

## Data and Methodology

Data for this report come from several Census 2000 public data releases. Geographic data are drawn from Summary File-2, a set of tables describing characteristics of households based on the race/ethnicity of the "householder," the person who filled out the census form.

Estimates of other demographic characteristics are made using the Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS). The 5\% PUMS represents a one in four sample of the approximately $26 \%$ of American households that filled out a census long-form. The 1\% PUMS represents a one in sixteen sample of the same households. The census long-form contains detailed information about all members of the household, including citizenship, country of origin, and a variety of demographic and economic characteristics.

Latinos and Latinas (Latino/as) are defined as those who identified their ethnicity as "Spanish/Hispanic/Latino" when filling out the census forms. All persons who identified as such, regardless of how they identified themselves in the various race categories, are designated as Latino/a in this report.

Estimates of characteristics of same-sex couples and their families are made from a sample of those families drawn from both the $5 \%$ and $1 \%$ PUMS files for the state of California. The California sample includes 6,037 same-sex couples. Of these couples, 1,834 include at least one Latino/a.

Characteristics of different-sex couples and their families are estimated using the 1\% PUMS sample only. This sample includes 65,669 couples in California. Of these couples, 19,934 include at least one Latino/a.

Same-sex couples are identified from the roster that the householder uses to describe how every person in the house is related to him or her. These same-sex couples are commonly understood to be primarily gay and lesbian couples even though the Census does not ask any questions about sexual orientation, sexual behavior, or sexual attraction (three common ways used to identify gay men and lesbians in surveys). Rather, census forms include a number of relationship categories to define how individuals in a household are related to the householder. These fall into two broad categories: related persons (including husband/wife, son/daughter, brother/sister, etc.), and unrelated persons (including unmarried partner, housemate/roommate, roomer/border, other non-relative, etc.).

Since 1990, the Census Bureau has included an "unmarried partner" category to describe an unrelated household member's relationship to the householder. If the householder describes another adult of the same sex as his or her "unmarried partner" or "husband/wife," the household counts as a same-sex unmarried partner household (see Gates and Ost 2004 for a detailed explanation of counting same-sex couples).

The Census data regarding same-sex couples do not capture all gay men and lesbians in the United States for at least two important reasons. First, the Census only captures data about same-sex couples of which one person in the couple is the partner of the household. The Census does not identify single gay men and lesbians. Limited data make it difficult to assess exactly how coupled gay men and lesbians might differ from their single counterparts, but in the general population, single people tend to be younger, less educated, and have lower incomes than their coupled counterparts.

In addition, the Census most likely undercounts even the population of same-sex couples. There are several potential reasons for suspecting an undercount. Concerns about revealing their sexual orientation (even indirectly) to the federal government may have led many gay and lesbian couples to indicate a status that would not indicate the true nature of their relationship. Other couples may have felt that "unmarried partner" or "husband/wife" does not accurately describe their relationship. A study of the undercount of same-sex unmarried partners in Census 2000 indicates that these were the two most common reasons that gay and lesbian couples chose not to designate themselves as unmarried partners (Badgett and Rogers 2003). Census tabulations also would not capture couples living in a household with someone else who filled out the census form. While determining the size of this undercount is challenging, estimates suggest that the true counts are 10 to 50 percent higher than the Census figures (Gates and Ost 2004).

In addition to undercounting the number of same-sex couples in the population, the Census may also erroneously include some different-sex couples in the same-sex couple population. Gates and Ost (2004) describe a measurement error resulting from different-sex married couples inadvertently checking the incorrect sex of one of the partners. This error, although thought to be small, may impact some of the characteristics of same-sex couples. For example, estimates of child-rearing among same-sex couples could be overstated due to this sample error because different-sex couples are more likely to have children. The magnitude of this error is not easily ascertained, but Gates and Ost suggest that while national unadjusted figures show that 28.2\% of same-sex couples are raising children, a more accurate estimate that attempts to adjust for the presence of different-sex couples is $27.5 \%$. The estimates of child-rearing in this report do not adjust for this form of error and thus may somewhat overstate this characteristic.

## I. Latinolas in same-sex couples in California

The Census identified almost 45,000 Latino/as in same-sex couples in California. While Latino/as comprise $12.5 \%$ of individuals in same-sex couples in the United States, they are $24.8 \%$ of individuals in same-sex couples in California. Overall, $30 \%$ of same-sex couples in California ( 27,858 couples) include a Latino/a and $37 \%$ of Latino/a same-sex couples are interethnic, meaning one partner is a Latino/a and one is not.

In other words, when discussing the extension of marriage to same-sex couples in California, approximately one-fourth of the individuals that would be directly impacted are Latino/as and one-third of the couples that would be directly impacted include a Latino/as.

Chart 1: Ethnicity of individuals in same-sex couples in California


Latinola
Non-Latinola

## 75\%

There are more Latino/as in same-sex couples in California than in any other state; over 30\% of the 147,000 Latino/as in same-sex couples identified in the United States live in California. California ranks second, after New Mexico (see Table 1), as the state with the highest per capita rate of Latino/a same-sex partners within the adult population, with 18.2 Latino/as same-sex partners per 10,000 adults.

## Table 1: Prevalence of Latinola same-sex unmarried partners among adults (age 18+), top ten states

| Rank | State | Latino/a same-sex <br> unmarried partners <br> per 10,000 adults | Latinola same- <br> sex unmarried <br> partners |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | New Mexico | 24.0 | 3,151 |
| 2 | California | 18.2 | 44,821 |
| 3 | District of Columbia | 17.2 | 786 |
| 4 | Texas | 15.8 | 23,626 |
| 5 | Arizona | 13.8 | 5,196 |
| 6 | Nevada | 12.8 | 1,904 |
| 7 | Colorado | 9.5 | 3,039 |
| 8 | Florida | 9.4 | 12,376 |
| 9 | New York | 9.3 | 13,322 |
| 10 | Utah | 7.5 | 1,137 |

Sources: Census 2000 SF-1, PUMS (5\% and 1\% combined)
In California, the vast majority of same-sex couples including at least one Latino/a reside in Los Angeles County ( 7,930 couples) (see Appendix 1). Imperial County has the highest per capita rate of Latino/a same-sex couples at 3.7 per 1,000 households ${ }^{1}$ (see Table 2).

In California, Latino/a same-sex couples tend to live where different-sex Latino/a couples live, as opposed to where other same-sex couples live. The top ten counties ranked by per capita
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rates of Latino/a same-sex couples and all Latino/a couples share the same ten counties (although not in the exact same order). There is only one county (Los Angeles) common to the Latino/a same-sex couple list and the list for all same-sex couples. In Table 2, the blue shading indicates the counties that overlap with the top ten counties for Latino/a same-sex couples.

Table 2: Per-capita households with a Latinola householder ${ }^{\text {a }}$, by California counties

|  | Latinola same-sex couple households |  |  | Latinola couple households |  |  | Same-sex couple households |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | County | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { 1,000 } \\ \text { House- } \\ \text { holds } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Households | County | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ 1,000 \\ \text { House- } \\ \text { holds } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Households | County | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { 1,000 } \\ \text { House- } \\ \text { holds } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Households |
| 1 | Imperial | 3.7 | 146 | Imperial | 634.5 | 24,989 | San Francisco | 27.0 | 8,902 |
| 2 | Tulare | 3.1 | 344 | Tulare | 386.3 | 42,645 | Sonoma | 12.3 | 2,125 |
| 3 | Madera | 2.7 | 98 | San Benito | 367.1 | 5,832 | Alameda | 11.2 | 5,884 |
| 4 | San Benito | 2.7 | 43 | Merced | 349.8 | 22,322 | Santa Cruz | 10.7 | 979 |
| 5 | Monterey | 2.6 | 320 | Fresno | 340.3 | 86,085 | Marin | 10.5 | 1,052 |
| 6 | Kings | 2.6 | 89 | Kings | 338.9 | 11,663 | Mendocino | 8.5 | 284 |
| 7 | Los Angeles | 2.5 | 7,930 | Colusa | 330.3 | 2,014 | Riverside | 8.4 | 4,242 |
| 8 | Merced | 2.5 | 159 | Los Angeles | 322.9 | 1,011,969 | Lake | 8.2 | 196 |
| 9 | Fresno | 2.4 | 602 | Madera | 320.1 | 11,573 | San Mateo | 8.1 | 2,058 |
| 10 | Colusa | 2.3 | 14 | Monterey | 310.7 | 37,671 | Los Angeles | 8.0 | 25,173 |

Source: Census 2000, SF-2
${ }^{\text {a }}$ A householder is the person who filled out the census form for the entire household. Households included in Latino/a households had a householder who identified as a Latino/a. Seventy-eight percent of California same-sex couples that include a Latino/a had a Latino/a as the householder.

## II. Ethnic Heritage

Approximately three-quarters of Latino/as in California who are part of a same-sex couple are of Mexican origin, a figure similar to the proportion among all Latino/a adults (see Table 3). Among the remainder of detailed ethnic categories, only Salvadoran, Puerto Rican, Guatemalan, and Cuban ethnicities represent more than one percent of Latino/as within samesex couples.
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Table 3: Detailed ethnic heritage for Latinolas within same-sex couples and among all adults, California

| Detailed ethnicity | Latino/a <br> partners in <br> a same-sex <br> couple | Latinola <br> adults |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Mexican | $74.4 \%$ | $77.0 \%$ |
| Other Spanish or Latino/a | $13.2 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ |
| Salvadoran | $2.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Puerto Rican | $2.2 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Guatemalan | $1.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Cuban | $1.1 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Nicaraguan | $0.7 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Honduran | $0.5 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Peruvian | $0.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Costa Rican | $0.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Spaniard | $0.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Argentinean | $0.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Colombian | $0.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Panamanian | $0.3 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Other South American | $0.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Other Central American | $0.2 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Venezuelan | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Ecuadorian | $0.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Dominican | $0.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Chilean | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Bolivian | $0.0 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Paraguayan | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Uruguayan | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

## IV. Individual Characteristics

In this section, we make two types of comparisons. First, we compare all Latino/as in same-sex couples with non-Latino/as in same-sex couples. Second, we compare both of these groups to their different sex counterparts.

The blue shading in Table 4 indicates characteristics where there is more similarity between Latino/as in same-sex couples and their different-sex counterparts for each characteristic. The
yellow shading indicates the one characteristic, sex, where there is more similarity between this group and non-Latino/a individuals in same-sex couples. A pattern emerges: Latino/as in same-sex couples in California have individual characteristics that differ significantly from the population of non-Latino/as in same-sex couples, but are fairly similar to their different-sex coupled counterparts.

Thus, the first set of comparisons poses a question - why do Latino/as in same-sex couples look different, among a number of individual characteristics, from non-Latino/as in same-sex couples? The second set of comparisons may provide much of the explanation: Latino/as in same-sex couples have more in common with the Latino/a community than the LGBT community generally. These comparisons may suggest that Latino/a heritage plays a stronger role than sexual orientation in shaping the individual characteristics of this population.

Finally, the green shading indicates three characteristics, having a college degree, individual income, and speaking a non-English language, where there are significant differences between Latino/as in same-sex couples and Latino/as in different-sex couples. However, even for these characteristics there is still more similarity between Latino/as in same- and different-sex couples than between Latino and non-Latino same-sex couples. As suggested below, some interaction between Latino/a ethnicity and sexual orientation may be shaping these characteristics.

## Table 4: Demographic characteristics of individuals within couples, California

|  | Same-Sex |  | Different-Sex |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Latinolas | Non- <br> Latinolas | Latinolas | Non- <br> Latinolas |
| Female | $46 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Age (mean) | 38.4 | 43.7 | 40.0 | 48.1 |
| Disabled | $28 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Citizen | $58 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $91 \%$ |
| Military service | $7 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Speak English Well | $63 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| Speak non-English |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ language | $75 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Income (mean) | 23,731 | 47,995 | 21,506 | 43,792 |
| College degree | $13 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Public Assistance | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Employed | $61 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $65 \%$ |
| Type of employment |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Private for-profit | $76 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Non-profit | $5 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Public | $11 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Self-employed | $8 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $15 \%$ |

## Sex, Age, and Disability

In California, both Latino/a and non-Latino/a same-sex couples are more likely to be male couples. Forty-six percent of Latino/a same-sex couples in California are female couples.

Individuals in same-sex couples are, in general, younger than individuals in different-sex couples. Latino/as in couples, both same and different-sex, are younger than their non-Latino/a counterparts. Consequently, Latino/as in same-sex couples are the youngest of the four groups compared (38.4), but closer in age to their different-sex counterparts (40) than non-Latino/as in same-sex couples (43.7).

Latino/as in same-sex couples report higher rates of disability than non-Latino/as in same-sex couples (28\% v. 19\%), similar to their different-sex counterparts ( $25 \%$ Latino/as v. $18 \%$ nonLatino/as).

## Citizenship and Military Service

While non-Latino/a individuals in same-sex couples are slightly more likely to be citizens than non-Latino/a members of different-sex couples in California (94\% v. 91\%), Latino/as in samesex couples have much lower rates of citizenship (58\%) - rates comparable to their differentsex counterparts (56\%).

The same is true for their rates of military service: 7\% for both Latino/as in same-sex and different-sex couples, compared with $15 \%$ for non-Latino/as in same-sex couples and $18 \%$ for non-Latino/as in different-sex couples.

## Language Proficiency

Approximately the same percentage of Latino/as in same- and different-sex couples in California report that they speak English well ( $63 \%$ v. 61\%), while non-Latino/as in same-sex couples are slightly more likely to indicate that they speak English well than their different-sex counterparts (85\% v. 80\%).

However, when it comes to speaking a non-English language, Latino/as in same-sex couples may differ from their different-sex counterparts ( $75 \%$ v. $82 \%$ ), in part, because of their sexual orientation. They share with non-Latino/as in same-sex couples a smaller likelihood of speaking a non-English language than their different-sex counterparts ( $15 \% \mathrm{v} .23 \%$ for non-Latino/as).

## Income and Education

Sexual orientation may have a significant impact on the income and education levels of Latino/as in same-sex couples. Non-Latino/as in same-sex couples have higher incomes ( $\$ 47,995 \mathrm{v} . \$ 43,792$ ) and a greater likelihood of having a college degree ( $46 \% \mathrm{v} .35 \%$ ) than non-Latino/as in different sex couples. While Latino/as in same-sex couples have much lower incomes and education levels than their non-Latino/a counterparts, they also have higher incomes ( $\$ 23,731 \mathrm{v} . \$ 21,506$ ) and education levels ( $13 \% \mathrm{v} .8 \%$ with college degree) than Latino/as in different-sex couples.

Many studies show higher education levels among the gay and lesbian population when compared to the population in general (see Black, et al. 2000; Badgett 1995; Black et al. 2003; and Allegretto and Arthur 2001). This could be because gay men and lesbians with higher education levels are more likely to be "out" and report themselves as such on surveys. It could also be that gay men and lesbians seek education as a way to avoid future discrimination in the workplace. These studies also consistently find that despite higher levels of education, gay men tend to have lower incomes than other men. Consistent with their education levels, lesbian incomes are often higher than those of other women. This is true for Latino/as in California. Latinos (men) in same-sex couples have lower average incomes than Latinos in different-sex
couples (\$25,972 v. $\$ 30,369$ ). Conversely, Latinas (women) in same-sex couples have higher average incomes than their counterparts in different-sex couples ( $\$ 21,134 \mathrm{v}$. $\$ 13,086$ ).

## Employment

The employment patterns of Latino/as in same-sex couples closely resemble those of their different-sex counterparts, both in the percentage employed ( $61 \% \mathrm{v} .58 \%$ ) and a concentration in the private for-profit sector when compared to non-Latino/as. In contrast, non-Latino/as in same-sex couples in California have much higher rates of employment (74\%) when compared to their different-sex counterparts (65\%). This is primarily a result of substantially higher employment rates among women in same-sex couples (non-Latina) compared to those in different-sex couples ( $75 \%$ v. $57 \%$ ). Employment rates among non-Latino men do not differ between those coupled with other men and those coupled with women (73\%).

Rates of receiving public assistance are the same for Latino/as in same- and different-sex couples in California (3\%), just slightly higher than rates for non-Latino/as in such couples (2\%).

## V. Inter-ethnic Same-Sex Couples in California

The census data also allow us to make two types of comparisons regarding inter-ethnic samesex couples: 1) comparisons between Latino/as in intra- and inter-ethnic couples and 2) comparisons between Latino/as and non-Latino/as in inter-ethnic couples.

## Latinolas in intra-ethnic couples v. Latinolas in inter-ethnic couples

Latino/s in intra-ethnic same-sex couples differ in significant ways from Latino/as in inter-ethnic same-sex couples. They are much more likely to be non-citizens ( $51 \%$ v.11\%), to be on public assistance ( $4 \% \mathrm{v} .1 \%$ ), and to speak a non-English language ( $84 \% \mathrm{v} .45 \%$ ). They are much less likely to indicate that they speak English well (58\% v. 93\%), to have a college degree (7\% v. $33 \%$ ), and to be employed ( $55 \%$ v. $79 \%$ ). Not surprisingly then, they also have average individual incomes that are over $\$ 26,500$ less than those of Latinos in inter-ethnic same-sex couples, and household incomes that are over $\$ 35,000$ less.

## LATINOIAS IN SAME-SEX COUPLES IN CALIFORNIA: DATA FROM CENSUS 2000

Table 5: Demographic characteristics of Latinolas in inter-ethnic couples and intra-ethnic couples, California

|  | Same-sex |  | Different-sex |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Inter- <br> Ethnic <br> Couples | Both <br> Latinola <br> Couples | Inter- <br> Ethnic <br> Couples | Both <br> Latinola <br> Couples |
| Female | $45 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Age (mean) | 38.3 | 38.5 | 40.9 | 39.9 |
| Citizen | $89 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Military service | $11 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Public Assistance | $1 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Disabled | $18 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Speak non-English language | $45 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| Speak English well | $93 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Individual Income (mean) | $\$ 36,490$ | $\$ 19,830$ | $\$ 31,865$ | $\$ 19,642$ |
| Household income (mean) | $\$ 86,611$ | $\$ 51,251$ | $\$ 77,656$ | $\$ 49,243$ |
| Household income (median) | $\$ 72,000$ | $\$ 39,900$ | $\$ 62,900$ | $\$ 39,000$ |
| College degree | $33 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Employed | $79 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Type of employment |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Private for-profit | $64 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Non-profit | $8 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Public | $18 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Self-employed | $10 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

The average individual income, education levels, and employment rates are not significantly different between Latino/as in same- and different- sex intra-ethnic couples. However, they do differ significantly between those in same- and different-sex inter-ethnic couples. It appears that if there is a sexual orientation effect on these characteristics as we suggested above, it disproportionately impacts those Latino/as in inter-ethnic same-sex couples. It is not surprising that Latino/as in inter-ethnic couples fare better on these characteristics since most are coupled with White partners who on average have even higher incomes, education levels, and employment rates. What is left to be explained is why Latino/as in inter-ethnic same-sex couples are even more advantaged than Latino/as in inter-ethnic different-sex couples.

When household incomes of same-sex couples are compared with inter-ethnic and Latino/a same-sex couples, the mean household income of Latino/a same-sex couples in California is almost half that of non-Latino/a same-sex couples.

Chart 2: Mean household income of same-sex couples, California


## Latinolas v. Non-Latinolas in Inter-ethnic Same-Sex Couples

While there are differences between Latino/a members and non-Latino/a members of interethnic same-sex couples in California, generally Latino/a members of inter-ethnic same-sex couples in California are more similar to non-Latino/as in inter-ethnic same-sex couples than Latino/as in intra-ethnic same-sex couples. For each characteristic in Table 6 below, the blue shading indicates whether Latino/as in same-sex inter-ethnic couples are more similar to nonLatinos in such couples or Latino/as in intra-ethnic couples.

Except for being slightly younger, Latino/as in inter-ethnic same-sex couples look more like their non-Latino/a partners on the rest of the individual characteristics we analyzed. However, they are much less likely to have a college degree ( $33 \%$ v. $40 \%$ ) then their non-Latino/a partners and have average incomes that are over $\$ 9,500$ less. Not surprisingly, Latino/as in inter-ethnic couples have much higher rates of speaking a non-English language ( $45 \% \mathrm{v} .18 \%$ ), although they are almost half as likely to speak a non-English language as Latino/as in an intra-ethnic same-sex couple. They also differ noticeably from their non-Latino/a partners in rates of military services (11\% v. 15\%).

## LATINOIAS IN SAME-SEX COUPLES IN CALIFORNIA: DATA FROM CENSUS 2000

Table 6: Demographic characteristics of Latinolas and Non-Latinolas in inter-ethnic same-sex couples, California.

|  | Inter-ethnic |  | Both <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Latinola <br> Latinola |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Age (mean) | 39.7 | 38.3 |  |
| Citizen | $96 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Military service | $15 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Public Assistance | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Disabled | $20 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Speak non-English language | $18 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $84 \%$ |
| Speak English well | $87 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Income (mean) | 45,960 | 36,490 | 19,830 |
| College degree | $40 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Employed | $80 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Type of employment |  |  |  |
| Private for-profit | $63 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| Non-profit | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Public | $18 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Self-employed | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $7 \%$ |

In terms of the race of their non-Latino/a partners, Latino/as in inter-ethnic same-sex couples predominantly partner with Whites ( $86 \%$ ). This is similar to their different-sex counterparts.

Table 7: Race/Ethnicity of Non-Latinola Partner in Inter-Ethnic Couples in California

|  | Same-Sex | Different-Sex |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| White | $86 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| Black | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Latino/a | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| API | $5 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| AK Nat./Am. Ind. | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Other/Multiracial | $5 \%$ | $7 \%$ |

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not add to 100.

## VI. Household demographic characteristics

In this section, we turn from looking at individual characteristics to household characteristics. We focus our analysis of household characteristics on two issues that have come up in recent debates about extending marriage to same-sex couples in California:

1. Do same-sex couples raise children and need the same type of support and protections that the States provide to married couples?; and
2. Do members of same-sex couples depend upon each other in ways similar to members of different-sex couples, and therefore need the support and protections that marriage provides?

Our previous studies have shown that same-sex couples in California are raising children and depending upon each other at levels that show that they would benefit from the protections that marriage provides and may be at risk without those protections (Sears and Badgett, 2004). Our analysis here shows that this is even truer for Latino/a same-sex couples.

## Latinola same-sex couples raising children ${ }^{2}$

According to our analysis, Latino/a same-sex couples in California are much more likely to be raising their own children then non-Latino/a same-sex couples ( $69 \% \mathrm{v} .24 \%$ ). In fact, same-sex couples where both members are Latino/a have higher rates of raising their own children than non-Latino/a different-sex couples in California ( $69 \%$ v. $60 \%$ ). For Latino/a same-sex couples, the increased likelihood for Latino/as to be raising their own children appears to largely outweigh the decreased likelihood for same-sex couples to be raising their own children.

Both same-sex and different-sex Latino/a couples in California tend to raise more children (2.4 on average) compared to their non-Latino/a counterparts [1.8 (same-sex) and 1.9 (differentsex)].

Both same- and different-sex inter-ethnic couples tend to look more like non-Latino/a couples in terms of raising their own children and the number of children they are raising than Latino/a couples (either same- or different-sex).

That 69\% of Latino/as same-sex couples in California are raising their own children seems to be quite high. Several measurement error issues relating to same-sex couples in the Census could be exacerbated among Latino/a households and could cause estimates of child-rearing within same-sex couples to be inflated. The measurement error associated with married couples who miscode the sex of one of the partners was discussed earlier. A second form of error concerns mistakes in the designation of an unmarried partner. This occurs when the person filling out the census form (the householder) does not have a spouse or unmarried partner in the household, but does have a child or other adult in the household living with an unmarried partner. For example, if a female householder classifies the female unmarried partner of her son as an

[^1]"unmarried partner," then this household would be counted as a female same-sex unmarried partner, or lesbian, household. While this type of error has negligible effects on the quality of the data at a national level (see Black et al., 2000), it could be more common in analyses of certain communities where extended families are more likely to be living in the home, and households are larger.

Both of these forms of measurement error would have the greatest effect on analyses of samesex households with children, especially Latino/a households. Since 58\% of Latino/a households have children under years of age 18 living in them, compared with only $36 \%$ of all households in the U.S., a measurement error in this population that results in additional mistaken coding of same-sex unmarried partner households would have a disproportionate effect on statistics involving same-sex couples with children.

Unfortunately, there are no exact ways available to correct for all of these measurement errors. However, Gates (2005) has developed a procedure to attempt to correct for the impact of sex miscoding among married couples. As an example, applying this correction procedure to the estimate of same-sex dual Latino/a couples aged $25-55$ reduces the rate of child-rearing from $70 \%$ to $57 \%$. This suggests that child-rearing estimates among this group of same-sex couples could be inflated by nearly $20 \%$.

We report the numbers above, however, because the Census Bureau itself does not believe that these errors have a significant impact on the Census data regarding same-sex couples.

## Table 8: Demographic characteristics of couples with children, both partners aged 25-55, California

|  | Same-sex |  |  | Different-sex |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Interethnic | Both Latinola | NonLatinola | Interethnic | Both Latinola | NonLatinola |
| Raising own children | 24\% | 69\% | 24\% | 64\% | 83\% | 60\% |
| Avg. number of own children | 1.9 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.9 |
| Age | 36.6 | 36.5 | 38.8 | 37.6 | 36.6 | 39.7 |
| College degree | 22\% | 5\% | 38\% | 23\% | 5\% | 39\% |
| Mean household income | 68,344 | 46,264 | 86,084 | 77,825 | 47,699 | 96,191 |
| Median household income | 59,000 | 35,400 | 67,300 | 63,700 | 38,600 | 73,930 |
| Own home | 52\% | 40\% | 63\% | 63\% | 46\% | 70\% |

Non-Latino/a same-sex parents in California tend to have fewer resources than their differentsex counterparts. Their average household incomes are more than $\$ 10,000$ lower than their different-sex counterparts and they are less likely to own a home ( $63 \% \mathrm{v} .70 \%$ ). In addition, the education advantage that individuals in same-sex couples as a whole have (those with and without their own children) disappears. Non-Latino/a same-sex parents are no more likely to have a college degree than their different-sex counterparts ( $38 \% \mathrm{v} .39 \%$ ).

The same is true for Latino/a same-sex parents in California. However, like Latino/a differentsex parents, they have even fewer economic resources. With average incomes similar to their different-sex counterparts, their average household incomes are approximately $\$ 40,000$ less than non-Latino/a same-sex parents in California. Similarly, they have much lower rates of home ownership ( $40 \%$ v. $63 \%$ of non-Latino/a same-sex parents). It could be that the combined effects of discrimination based on Latino/a heritage and sexual orientation result in Latino/a same-sex parents having fewer resources to raise their children than other parents in California.

Not surprisingly, inter-ethnic different-sex and same-sex couples have average incomes and homeownership rates that fall between non-Latino/a and Latino/a couples.


Chart 4: Home ownership among couples raising children, California


An estimated 36,000 children under age 18 are living in the households of same-sex Latino/a couples, of which 30,740 are the "own child" of the person who filled out the census form.

Among the "own children" of same-sex couples, 4,583 (15\%) are being raised by inter-ethnic couples, while 26,157 ( $85 \%$ ) are being raised by couples where both persons are Latino/as.

The children being raised by Latino/a same-sex couples are substantially less likely to be adopted than the children of non-Latino/a same-sex couples in California ( $2 \% \mathrm{v} .8 \%$ ). The fact that Latino/a same-sex parents have fewer economic resources may explain why they are less likely to have adopted children - adoption can be expensive. In addition, they may be more likely to have children from a prior different-sex relationships than non-Latino/a same-sex parents in California. The stigmatization of homosexuality within racial and ethnic minority communities can sometimes lead to gay men and lesbians within those communities coming out later in life and thus being more likely to have already had children in previous different-sex relationships.

Unfortunately, census records do not allow us to identify the exact relationship between a child and both partners of same-sex couples or the circumstances that led to the children being raised by the couple. But given the number of children identified as adopted, it does appear that Latino/a same-sex couples have a higher proportion of biological children than non-Latino/a same-sex couples. The racial/ethnic composition of children provides further evidence of a biological connection, as 99\% of the children of same-sex Latino/a couples are also Latino/a. Sixty-one percent of the children of inter-ethnic same-sex couples are Latino/a, while 29\% are White and 5\% are Black. Only $2 \%$ of the children of non-Latino/a same-sex parents are Latino/a.

Table 9: Demographic characteristics of the own children of couples, California

|  | Same-sex |  |  | Different-sex |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Inter- <br> ethnic | Both <br> Latinola | Both <br> Non- <br> Latinola | Inter- <br> ethnic | Both <br> Latinola |  |
| Under 5 years old | $31 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $28 \%$ |  |
| Adopted | Both <br> Latinola |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disabled | $5 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |  |
| Race/ethnicity: | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ |  |
| White |  |  |  |  | $5 \%$ |  |
| Black | $29 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $1 \%$ |  |
| Latino/a | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |
| API | $61 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $99 \%$ |  |
| AK Nat./Am. Ind. | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |
| Other/Multiracial | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |

When all Latino/a children under 18 who are residing with same-sex couples in California are considered, $98 \%$ of such children are in a household where at least one parent is a Latino/a and 88\% percent are being raised in a household where both parents are Latino/a.

## LATINOIAS IN SAME-SEX COUPLES IN CALIFORNIA: DATA FROM CENSUS 2000

## Interdependence ${ }^{3}$

Another issue that has come up in the debate about extending marriage to same-sex couples is whether same-sex couples rely upon each other economically in ways similar to married couples. Previous studies of California census data regarding same-sex couples have shown that such couples display a high level of interdependence, measured in terms of disparities in income and earnings potential, investing in real property, and making major life decisions together such as raising children (Sears and Badgett, 2004). Members within these couples depend upon each other even though they do not have the protections that marriage provides. Latino/a same-sex couples also display many indicators of economic interdependence despite the fact that they are not protected by the rights or obligations of marriage.

## Income, employment, and college education

Latino/a same-sex couples have nearly the same average differences in income between the partners as different-sex couples (\$21,340 v. \$21,726). Inter-ethnic Latino/a couples have a higher average income difference than dual Latino/a couples. When the difference in individual income is expressed as a percentage of mean household income, Latino/a same-sex couples show the same degree of interdependence as non-Latino/a same-sex couples and a higher degree of interdependence than inter-ethnic Latino/a couples.

The proportion of couples with only one partner employed is comparable among same-sex and different-sex Latino/a couples (39\% v. 40\%). Couples with two Latino/a partners are more likely to have only one partner employed than are inter-ethnic Latino/a couples and non-Latino/a couples, both same- and different-sex.

Some of the factors that result in these income and employment disparities may reflect decisions that couples are likely to make together: hours worked, degree of labor force participation, time in child-rearing, etc. However, same-sex couples are making these decisions without the protections that marriage provides, such as community property and spousal support upon dissolution of the relationship.

Latino/a same-sex and different-sex couples show much less disparity in education levels among partners (one having a college degree and the other not), but it is important to note that they are significantly less likely to have a college degree than members of other couples.

## Disability and public assistance

The fact that one member of a couple is disabled or on public assistance may also indicate a level of economic interdependence within the couple. One partner is disabled and one is not among $23 \%$ of same-sex Latino/a couples, compared to $22 \%$ of different-sex Latino/a couples. Same-sex couples where both partners are Latino/a are the most likely to have one partner having received public assistance (7\%).

[^2]Homeownership, co-residential stability, and childrearing
The fact that a couple owns a home, have been together for a period of time, or are raising children may indicate that they are pooling resources and making long-term decisions together.

Homeownership rates for same-sex couples are generally lower among Latino/a couples than all couples and are also lower among same-sex couples compared to different-sex couples. Among same-sex Latino/a couples, $39 \%$ own their homes compared to $49 \%$ of different-sex Latino/a couples. In both groups, home ownership rates are higher among inter-ethnic couples.

Measuring the extent to which couples have lived together in the same home for the past five years offers a measure of stability within couples. This rate does not vary much between samesex and different-sex Latino/a couples, 47\% v. 49\% respectively.

Same-sex Latino/a couples are less likely than different-sex couples - but substantially more likely than all same-sex couples - to be raising children. Nearly 62\% of all Latino/a same-sex couples are raising children. The percentage of inter-ethnic same-sex couples raising children is closer to that of non-Latino/a same-sex couples (23\% v. 20\%). ${ }^{4}$

Table 10: Measurements of interdependence from household characteristics of couples, California

$\left.$|  | Same-sex |  |  | Different-sex |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Inter- <br> Ethnic | Latinola | Non- <br> Latinola | Inter- <br> Ethnic | Latinola |  | | Non- |
| :---: |
| Latinola | \right\rvert\,

[^3]
## Appendix 1: Same-sex coupled households with a Latinola householder ${ }^{\text {a }}$ in California counties

| County Name | Same-sex <br> Latino/a couple households | All Latino/a households | All households | Same-sex Latino/a couples per 1,000 households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Los Angeles | 7,930 | 1,011,969 | 3,133,774 | 2.5 |
| San Diego | 1,403 | 181,713 | 994,677 | 1.4 |
| Orange | 1,372 | 182,312 | 935,287 | 1.5 |
| Riverside | 954 | 126,998 | 506,218 | 1.9 |
| San Bernardino | 952 | 154,758 | 528,594 | 1.8 |
| Santa Clara | 800 | 90,457 | 565,863 | 1.4 |
| Alameda | 747 | 67,844 | 523,366 | 1.4 |
| San Francisco | 747 | 31,803 | 329,700 | 2.3 |
| Fresno | 602 | 86,085 | 252,940 | 2.4 |
| Sacramento | 436 | 53,008 | 453,602 | 1.0 |
| Ventura | 418 | 53,830 | 243,234 | 1.7 |
| Contra Costa | 408 | 41,284 | 344,129 | 1.2 |
| Kern | 374 | 58,131 | 208,652 | 1.8 |
| Tulare | 344 | 42,645 | 110,385 | 3.1 |
| Monterey | 320 | 37,671 | 121,236 | 2.6 |
| San Mateo | 309 | 36,421 | 254,103 | 1.2 |
| San Joaquin | 307 | 41,645 | 181,629 | 1.7 |
| Santa Barbara | 223 | 31,078 | 136,622 | 1.6 |
| Stanislaus | 219 | 32,962 | 145,146 | 1.5 |
| Sonoma | 210 | 17,168 | 172,403 | 1.2 |
| Santa Cruz | 164 | 14,422 | 91,139 | 1.8 |
| Merced | 159 | 22,322 | 63,815 | 2.5 |
| Imperial | 146 | 24,989 | 39,384 | 3.7 |
| Solano | 126 | 16,423 | 130,403 | 1.0 |
| Madera | 98 | 11,573 | 36,155 | 2.7 |
| Kings | 89 | 11,663 | 34,418 | 2.6 |
| Marin | 80 | 6,257 | 100,650 | 0.8 |
| Yolo | 72 | 11,374 | 59,375 | 1.2 |
| San Luis Obispo | 61 | 9,455 | 92,739 | 0.7 |
| Placer | 51 | 6,600 | 93,382 | 0.5 |
| Butte | 50 | 5,618 | 79,566 | 0.6 |
| Napa | 46 | 6,451 | 45,402 | 1.0 |
| San Benito | 43 | 5,832 | 15,885 | 2.7 |
| Sutter | 34 | 4,246 | 27,033 | 1.3 |
| El Dorado | 27 | 3,808 | 58,939 | 0.5 |
| Mendocino | 26 | 3,171 | 33,266 | 0.8 |
| Yuba | 20 | 2,474 | 20,535 | 1.0 |
| Shasta | 18 | 2,378 | 63,426 | 0.3 |
| Humboldt | 15 | 2,313 | 51,238 | 0.3 |
| Nevada | 15 | 1,318 | 36,894 | 0.4 |
| Colusa | 14 | 2,014 | 6,097 | 2.3 |
| Lake | 14 | 1,637 | 23,974 | 0.6 |
| Tehama | 10 | 2,136 | 21,013 | 0.5 |

## LATINOIAS IN SAME-SEX COUPLES IN CALIFORNIA: DATA FROM CENSUS 2000

| Glenn | 8 | 1,876 | 9,172 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Siskiyou | 7 | 914 | 18,556 |
| Calaveras | 7 | 770 | 16,469 |
| Tuolumne | 7 | 924 | 21,004 |
| Del Norte | 6 | 589 | 9,170 |
| Lassen | 4 | 602 | 9,625 |
| Mariposa | 4 | 287 | 6,613 |
| Mono | 3 | 553 | 5,137 |
| Inyo | 3 | 606 | 7,703 |
| Amador | 2 | 517 | 12,759 |
| Modoc | 1 | 256 | 3,784 |
| Sierra | 1 | 57 | 1,520 |
| Plumas | 1 | 322 | 9,000 |
| Trinity | - | 140 | 5,587 |
| Alpine | - | - | 0.4 |

${ }^{a} A$ householder is the person who filled out the census form for the entire household. Households included in Latino/a households had a householder who identified as a Latino/a. Seventy-eight percent of California same-sex couples that include a Latino/a had a Latino/a as the householder.

## LATINOIAS IN SAME-SEX COUPLES IN CALIFORNIA: DATA FROM CENSUS 2000

Appendix 2: Per-capita households with a Latinola householder ${ }^{\text {a }}$, by California counties

| Rank | Latinola same-sex couple households |  |  | Latinola households |  |  | Same-sex couple households |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | County | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \mathbf{1 , 0 0 0} \end{gathered}$ <br> Households | Households | County | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \mathbf{1 , 0 0 0} \end{gathered}$ <br> Households | Households | County | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { 1,000 } \\ \text { House- } \\ \text { holds } \end{gathered}$ | Households |
| 1 | Imperial | 3.7 | 146 | Imperial | 634.5 | 24,989 | San Francisco | 27.0 | 8,902 |
| 2 | Tulare | 3.1 | 344 | Tulare | 386.3 | 42,645 | Sonoma | 12.3 | 2,125 |
| 3 | Madera | 2.7 | 98 | San Benito | 367.1 | 5,832 | Alameda | 11.2 | 5,884 |
| 4 | San Benito | 2.7 | 43 | Merced | 349.8 | 22,322 | Santa Cruz | 10.7 | 979 |
| 5 | Monterey | 2.6 | 320 | Fresno | 340.3 | 86,085 | Marin | 10.5 | 1,052 |
| 6 | Kings | 2.6 | 89 | Kings | 338.9 | 11,663 | Mendocino | 8.5 | 284 |
| 7 | Los Angeles | 2.5 | 7,930 | Colusa | 330.3 | 2,014 | Riverside | 8.4 | 4,242 |
| 8 | Merced | 2.5 | 159 | Los Angeles | 322.9 | 1,011,969 | Lake | 8.2 | 196 |
| 9 | Fresno | 2.4 | 602 | Madera | 320.1 | 11,573 | San Mateo | 8.1 | 2,058 |
| 10 | Colusa | 2.3 | 14 | Monterey | 310.7 | 37,671 | Los Angeles | 8.0 | 25,173 |

Source: Census 2000, SF-2
${ }^{\text {a }}$ A householder is the person who filled out the census form for the entire household. Households included in Latino/a households had a householder who identified as a Latino/a. Seventy-eight percent of California same-sex couples that include a Latino/a had a Latino/a as the householder.

Appendix 3: Demographic characteristics of individuals within couples, California

|  | Individuals in same-sex couples |  |  |  |  | Individuals in different-sex couples |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Latinolas } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | hnic <br> Latinola | $\begin{gathered} \text { Both } \\ \text { Latinola } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | All nonLatinolas | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Latinolas } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | hnic <br> Latinola | $\begin{gathered} \text { Both } \\ \text { Latinola } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | All nonLatinolas |
| Female | 46\% | 43\% | 45\% | 47\% | 48\% | 51\% | 44\% | 57\% | 50\% | 50\% |
| Age (mean) | 38.4 | 39.7 | 38.3 | 38.5 | 43.7 | 40.0 | 41.0 | 40.9 | 39.9 | 48.1 |
| Citizen | 58\% | 96\% | 89\% | 49\% | 94\% | 56\% | 95\% | 88\% | 50\% | 91\% |
| Military service | 7\% | 15\% | 11\% | 5\% | 15\% | 7\% | 17\% | 13\% | 6\% | 18\% |
| Public Assistance | 3\% | 1\% | 1\% | 4\% | 2\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 2\% |
| Disabled | 28\% | 20\% | 18\% | 31\% | 19\% | 25\% | 18\% | 16\% | 27\% | 18\% |
| Speak non-English language | 75\% | 18\% | 45\% | 84\% | 15\% | 82\% | 18\% | 45\% | 88\% | 23\% |
| Speak English well | 63\% | 87\% | 93\% | 58\% | 85\% | 61\% | 88\% | 93\% | 58\% | 80\% |
| Race/ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 0\% | 86\% | 0\% | 0\% | 81\% | 0\% | 81\% | 0\% | 0\% | 74\% |
| Black | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 6\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 6\% |
| Latino/a | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% |
| API | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 8\% | 0\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 16\% |
| AK Nat./Am. Ind. | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Other/Multiracial | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| Income (mean) | 23,731 | 45,960 | 36,490 | 19,830 | 47,995 | 21,506 | 41,470 | 31,865 | 19,642 | 43,792 |
| College degree | 13\% | 40\% | 33\% | 7\% | 46\% | 8\% | 25\% | 21\% | 5\% | 35\% |
| Employed | 61\% | 80\% | 79\% | 55\% | 74\% | 58\% | 76\% | 71\% | 55\% | 65\% |
| Type of employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private for-profit | 76\% | 63\% | 64\% | 80\% | 59\% | 75\% | 67\% | 66\% | 77\% | 61\% |
| Non-profit | 5\% | 8\% | 8\% | 4\% | 9\% | 4\% | 5\% | 6\% | 3\% | 6\% |
| Public | 11\% | 18\% | 18\% | 9\% | 17\% | 12\% | 17\% | 19\% | 10\% | 17\% |
| Self-employed | 8\% | 10\% | 10\% | 7\% | 14\% | 9\% | 11\% | 9\% | 9\% | 15\% |

Appendix 4: Household demographic characteristics of couples, California

|  | Same-sex couple households |  |  |  |  | Different-sex couple households |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Any couple with a Latinola | Interethnic | Both Latinola | NonLatinola | All | Any couple Latinola | Interethnic | Both Latinola | NonLatinola | All |
| Median household income | 50,500 | 72,000 | 39,900 | 77,000 | 68,800 | 44,300 | 62,900 | 39,000 | 70,000 | 61,000 |
| Mean household income | 64,392 | 86,611 | 51,251 | 100,297 | 89,442 | 56,650 | 77,656 | 49,243 | 92,309 | 81,503 |
| Difference in age | 6.0 | 6.3 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| Measures of Interdependence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difference in HH income | 25,615 | 32,843 | 21,340 | 42,146 | 37,148 | 25,812 | 37,399 | 21,726 | 48,185 | 41,406 |
| One partner employed | 34\% | 27\% | 39\% | 26\% | 29\% | 38\% | 33\% | 40\% | 32\% | 34\% |
| One partner w/ college degree | 17\% | 32\% | 8\% | 29\% | 25\% | 10\% | 21\% | 7\% | 25\% | 21\% |
| One partner disabled | 23\% | 23\% | 23\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 18\% | 22\% | 19\% | 20\% |
| One partner on public assistance | 5\% | 3\% | 7\% | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 4\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| Own Home | 44\% | 53\% | 39\% | 63\% | 57\% | 52\% | 63\% | 49\% | 73\% | 67\% |
| Together at least 5 years | 44\% | 39\% | 47\% | 46\% | 45\% | 48\% | 47\% | 49\% | 57\% | 54\% |
| Raising own children | 48\% | 23\% | 62\% | 20\% | 28\% | 69\% | 55\% | 74\% | 42\% | 50\% |

[^4]
## Appendix 5: Demographic characteristics of couples with children, both partners aged 25-55, California

|  | Same-sex couple households |  |  |  |  | Different-sex couple households |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Any couple with a Latinola | Interethnic | Both Latinola | NonLatinola | All | Any couple with a Latinola | Interethnic | Both Latinola | NonLatinola | All |
| Raising own children | 51\% | 24\% | 69\% | 24\% | 32\% | 78\% | 64\% | 83\% | 60\% | 66\% |
| Avg. number of own children | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| Age | 36.5 | 36.6 | 36.5 | 38.8 | 37.7 | 36.8 | 37.6 | 36.6 | 39.7 | 38.6 |
| College degree | 8\% | 22\% | 5\% | 38\% | 23\% | 9\% | 23\% | 5\% | 39\% | 27\% |
| Own home | 43\% | 52\% | 40\% | 63\% | 53\% | 49\% | 63\% | 46\% | 70\% | 62\% |
| Mean household income | 50,348 | 68,344 | 46,264 | 86,084 | 68,160 | 53,993 | 77,825 | 47,699 | 96,191 | 78,939 |
| Median household income | 39,400 | 59,000 | 35,400 | 67,300 | 52,000 | 42,800 | 63,700 | 38,600 | 73,930 | 60,000 |
| Race/ethnicity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 7\% | 39\% | 0\% | 68\% | 38\% | 9\% | 40\% | 0\% | 67\% | 44\% |
| Black | 1\% | 3\% | 0\% | 11\% | 6\% | 1\% | 2\% | 0\% | 7\% | 4\% |
| Latino/a | 91\% | 49\% | 100\% | 0\% | 45\% | 89\% | 50\% | 100\% | 0\% | 36\% |
| API | 1\% | 3\% | 0\% | 15\% | 8\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 22\% | 13\% |
| AK Nat./Am. Ind. | <1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | <1\% | <1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | <1\% |
| Other/Multiracial | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 5\% | 3\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 4\% | 2\% |

[^5]Appendix 6: Demographic characteristics of the own children of couples, California

|  | Same-sex couple households |  |  |  |  | Different-sex couple households |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Any couple with a Latinola | Interethnic | Both Latinola | NonLatinola | All | Any couple with a Latinola | Interethnic | Both Latinola | NonLatinola | All |
| Under 5 years old | 30\% | 31\% | 30\% | 27\% | 29\% | 28\% | 30\% | 28\% | 26\% | 27\% |
| Adopted | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 8\% | 5\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 3\% | 2\% |
| Race/ethnicity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 5\% | 29\% | <1\% | 60\% | 29\% | 5\% | 26\% | 1\% | 64\% | 38\% |
| Black | 1\% | 5\% | <1\% | 12\% | 6\% | <1\% | 2\% | <1\% | 7\% | 4\% |
| Latino/a | 93\% | 61\% | 99\% | 2\% | 53\% | 93\% | 68\% | 99\% | 1\% | 43\% |
| API | 1\% | 2\% | <1\% | 17\% | 8\% | <1\% | 2\% | <1\% | 20\% | 11\% |
| AK Nat./Am. Ind. | <1\% | <1\% | 0\% | 1\% | <1\% | <1\% | <1\% | <1\% | 1\% | <1\% |
| Other/Multiracial | <1\% | 2\% | <1\% | 8\% | 4\% | 1\% | 3\% | <1\% | 7\% | 4\% |

[^6]
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ A householder is the person who filled out the census form for the entire household. Households included in Latino/a households had a householder who identified as a Latino/a. Seventy-eight percent of California same-sex couples that include a Latino/a had a Latino/a as the householder.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ In this section, we control for age and only look at the population of couples with members between the ages of $25-55$. We do this because people in this age group are more likely to be raising their own children in this age range and doing so excludes a large number of older, different-sex couples who are no longer raising their own children. If these couples were included, the difference between the percentage of same-sex and different-sex couples raising their own children would be significantly smaller.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Unlike the prior subsection, the analysis in this sub-section is not limited to the age groups of adults between 25 and 55 years of age.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ The percentages for own children in Table 10 differ from those in Table 8 because the population analyzed in Table 8 is couples between the ages of 25 to 55, while the population considered in Table 10 is all couples.

[^4]:    Sources: Census 2000 PUMS (5\% and 1\%)

[^5]:    Source: Census 2000 PUMS (5\% and 1\%)

[^6]:    Source: Census 2000 PUMS (5\% and 1\%)

