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Prior Research
• Population-Based Surveys
  - Partners in same-gender unions are less alike in terms of demographic characteristics than partners in different-gender unions.
  - Scholars assume that weaker matching on characteristics for some union types (e.g., remarriages) is evidence of trade-offs or exchanges (Qian and Lichter 2018).

Internet Dating Websites
• Gay male daters place more value than do heterosexual daters on characteristics such as race and age (i.e., sexual racism and ageism).

Analyses of Matching

- Table 1: Race Rates and Conditional Matching by Union Type

Data and Methods
- Contrast 3 types of coresidential unions using the 2017 5-Year American Community Survey in terms of matching on race/ethnicity:
  - Different-gender unions (n = 3,419,495)
  - Same-gender female unions (n = 24,031)
  - Same-gender male unions (n = 22,941)

- Assess matching on multiple characteristics using a conditional logit model (McFadden 1973).
- Compare actual partners with fictional partners randomly drawn from the same union type (e.g., Jepsen and Jepsen 2002) and state.
- Examine patterns of exchange for particular racial pairings among same-gender male unions.

Analyses of Exchange

- Table 2: Income and Age Rates of Same-Gender Male Coresidential Unions

Figure 1. Race of Partners by Union Type

Figure 2. Average Values for Partners from Specific Racial Pairings: Same-Gender Male Coresidential Unions

Conclusion
• With the exception of income, matching on demographic characteristics is strongest for different-gender unions and weakest for same-gender male unions.
• All of the different-race unions, Asian male & White male pairings occur at rates closest to expected based on opportunities for contact within states.
• Asian male & White male pairings exhibit both patterns of both matching (on income and education) and exchange (on age).

Next Steps
• Remove 889 same-gender marriages.
• Draw fictional partners from PUMAs (not states).
• Use the replicate weights and adjust for design effects.
• Run loglinear models to detect matching and exchange (e.g., Schwartz et al. 2016).
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