

# Online Appendix

## Policy Effects on Mixed-Citizenship, Same-Sex Unions: A Triple-Difference Analysis

Nathan I. Hoffmann, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles  
Kristopher Velasco, Department of Sociology, Princeton University

December 5, 2022

### Contents

<b>A Sensitivity to Hypothetical Sex Misreporting</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>B Alternative Outcome Variables</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>6</b>

## A Sensitivity to Hypothetical Sex Misreporting

Published papers using the ACS to study same-sex couples overwhelmingly use the method by Gates and Steinberger (2009) employed our main paper to adjust for misreporting, where we drop all respondents that had either their relationship or sex variable allocated by the Census Bureau. However here we implement a novel method to adjust proportions of estimated immigrants in same-sex couples, based on the estimated mismatch rates from two U.S. Census Bureau studies. Beginning in 2019, the ACS provides explicit categories for “Opposite-sex husband/wife/spouse,” “Opposite-sex unmarried partner,” “Same-sex husband/wife/spouse,” and “Same-sex unmarried partner” (Walker and Taylor 2021), so sex misreporting in the 2019 data is unlikely, but we still adjust mismatch rates in these years as well.

In a Census Bureau working paper, Kreider and Lofquist (2015) use personal information such as names and addresses match same-sex couples from the 2010 ACS to Social Security administrative data. They find that 7 percent of unmarried couples coded as same-sex in the ACS are coded as different-sex in the administrative data, and 57 percent of married same-sex couples. A follow-up study (Kreider, Bates, and Mayol-García 2017) shows that these mismatch rates appear to have fallen: In a 2016 ACS test module that included explicit categories for different- and same-sex spouses and partners, 31 percent of married and 3 percent of unmarried same-sex couples had inconsistent sex responses.

To test the robustness of our results these levels of misreporting, we re-assign up to 60 percent of counts of individuals in same-sex couples to counts in different-sex couples, within state, year, and citizenship group. We then re-fit the models reported in the main paper, with state-level controls. Coefficients for the three-way interaction of interest are shown in Figure 1. Results are extremely robust to even high levels of sex misreporting. Since we model a relative rather than absolute change, this robustness makes sense.




Figure 1: Coefficients for the three-way interaction between indicators for same-sex, mixed-citizenship, and post-2013 survey year from Table 5, with counts of individuals in same-sex couples in the sample reduced by 10 to 60 percent

## B Alternative Outcome Variables

Table 1: Mixed vs. Same Nativity: Triple-difference (DDD), quasi-Poisson regressions of counts of individuals in mixed-nativity, same-sex couples couples, stratifying by state-country-year-group average policy environment

	Full sample	Progressive	Regressive
Post-2013 $\times$ Same-sex $\times$ Mixed-nativity	0.144 ** (0.050)	0.383 *** (0.081)	0.067 (0.076)
Post-2013 $\times$ Same-sex	0.372 *** (0.019)	0.375 *** (0.020)	0.375 *** (0.020)
Post-2013 $\times$ Mixed-nativity	0.150 *** (0.010)	0.535 *** (0.041)	0.122 *** (0.017)
Post-2013	-0.062 ** (0.021)	-0.089 *** (0.022)	-0.093 *** (0.020)
State LGB policy	0.004 (0.004)	0.006 (0.004)	0.006 (0.004)
State unemployment	0.001 (0.003)	-0.000 (0.003)	0.000 (0.003)
State per-capita income	0.004 (0.003)	0.005 † (0.003)	0.003 (0.003)
Observations	2400	2400	2400

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; †  $p < 0.1$ . The "Regressive" sample includes only countries with a LGB policy score less than 0, and the "Progressive" sample includes only those with a score greater than 3. Group-clustered standard errors shown in parentheses. Source: American Community Survey 2008-2019. Authors' calculations.

Table 2: Immigrant-containing couples vs. two U.S.-born: Triple-difference (DDD), quasi-Poisson regressions of counts of individuals in immigrant-containing, same-sex couples, stratifying by state-country-year-group average policy environment

	Full sample	Progressive	Regressive
Post-2013 × Same-sex × Immigrant-containing	0.165 *** (0.042)	0.343 *** (0.082)	0.025 (0.079)
Post-2013 × Same-sex	0.376 *** (0.019)	0.376 *** (0.020)	0.376 *** (0.020)
Post-2013 × Immigrant-containing	0.139 *** (0.019)	0.618 *** (0.047)	0.099 ** (0.031)
Post-2013	-0.063 ** (0.020)	-0.091 *** (0.019)	-0.093 *** (0.019)
State LGB policy	0.005 (0.004)	0.006 (0.004)	0.006 † (0.004)
State unemployment	0.002 (0.003)	0.000 (0.003)	0.000 (0.003)
State per-capita income	0.001 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)	0.003 (0.002)
Observations	2400	2400	2400

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; †  $p < 0.1$ . The "Regressive" sample includes only countries with a LGB policy score less than 0, and the "Progressive" sample includes only those with a score greater than 3. Group-clustered standard errors shown in parentheses. Source: American Community Survey 2008-2019. Authors' calculations.

## References

- Gates, Gary J., and Michael D. Steinberger. 2009. “Same-Sex Unmarried Partner Couples in the American Community Survey: The Role of Misreporting, Miscoding and Misallocation.” in *Annual meetings of the population association of america, detroit, MI*.
- Kreider, Rose M., Nancy Bates, and Yerís Mayol-García. 2017. “Improving Measurement of Same-Sex Couple Households in Census Bureau Surveys: Results from Recent Tests.” in *PAA 2017 annual meeting*. PAA.
- Kreider, Rose M., and Daphne A. Lofquist. 2015. *Matching Survey Data with Administrative Records to Evaluate Reports of Same-Sex Married Couple Households*. *SEHSD Working Paper*. 2019-30.
- Walker, Laquitta, and Danielle Taylor. 2021. *Same-Sex Couple Households: 2019. American Community Survey Briefs*. ACSBR-005. U.S. Census Bureau.