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Beyond POSSLQ

- Measurements of intimate relationships remain largely marriage v. everything else
  - “Everything else” still primarily POSSLQ, so...
    - Different-sex couples
    - Co-residency required
- Can we move beyond this limited conceptual framework?
  - More inclusive concepts of relationships
  - Greater conceptual clarity in measurement
  - Inclusion of same-sex couples
Its complicated...

- Reality of intimate relationships is complex
  - Complexity rarely observed in measurement strategies
- Couples do not necessarily see the choice as marriage v. cohabitation but rather single v. cohabitation
- Co-residency is far from binary
  - Even 5% of married couples do not co-reside
A proposed conceptual framework

- **Nature of relationships**
  - What terms do individuals use to describe their relationship status?
  - No need to tie this to co-residency

- **Relationship behaviors**
  - Co-residency
  - Resource allocation

- **Legal relationship status**
  - Marriage, civil union, registered domestic partnership
Conceptual clarity in measurement

- Household rosters conflate co-residency behavior with nature of relationship
- Marital status questions that include non-marital partnership conflate legal status with nature of relationship and co-residency behavior
  - **NSFG: What is your current marital status?**
    - A respondent can simultaneously be living with a partner, currently married, divorced, and widowed
    - Partner option conceptually veers away from assessing the current legal marital status
Conceptual clarity in measurement

- Marriage is largely the only relationship measured absent co-residency.
- Census/ACS household roster can affect coding of marital status, again conflating constructs:
  - Unmarried partners cannot be currently married.
- Census/ACS also confines relationship possibilities:
  - No multiple spouses and unmarried partners.
Measuring same-sex relationships

- Lack of conceptual clarity
- Measurement issues associated with small population
- Hetero-normative bias in measurement
- Lack of any measurement of non-marital forms of relationship recognition
Same-sex relationships in the US

Relationship Recognition for Same-Sex Couples in the U.S.

This map was last updated on: June 28, 2011

- States with full marriage equality:
  - Massachusetts (2004);
  - Connecticut (2008);
  - Iowa (2009);
  - Vermont (2009);
  - New Hampshire (2010);
  - District of Columbia (2010);
  - New York (2011)

- States with limited relationship recognition laws:
  - designated beneficiaries:
    - Colorado (2009);
    - Rhode Island (2001);
    - Maine (2004);
    - Maryland (2008); Wisconsin (2009)

- States with broad relationship recognition laws:
  - civil unions:
    - Vermont (2000);
    - New Jersey (2007); Illinois (2011); Delaware (2012); Hawaii (2012)
  - domestic partnerships:
    - California (2005); Oregon (2008); Washington (2008); Nevada (2009)

- States that recognize same-sex marriages performed in other states:
  - Rhode Island (2007);
  - Maryland (2010);
  - New Mexico (2011);
  - Illinois (2011)

- Relationship types:
  - Married (13.8%)
  - Civil Union or Registered Domestic Partnership (14.7%)
  - Also CU/RDP (42.8%)
  - No marriage or CU/RDP (57.2%)

A "broad law" is one that extends to same-sex couples all or nearly all the rights and responsibilities extended to married couples under state law, whether titled a "civil union" or "domestic partnership" law. Other relationship recognition laws offer more limited rights and protections.
What do terms like “married” or “husband/wife” mean for same-sex couples?

- Legally married with federal recognition
- Legally married regardless of recognition
- In a civil union or registered domestic partnership that includes all rights and responsibilities of marriage
- Married in a religious ceremony or had a commitment ceremony
Census Bureau coding procedures

- All same-sex couples are coded as unmarried partners in PUMS
- “Currently married” individuals in a same-sex couple have marital status allocated to something other than married
- Different-sex false positives create substantial measurement error
  - ACS 2007 and earlier: 30%
  - ACS 2008 and later: 15%
  - Census 2010: 25%
Hetero-normative bias

- Terms used in surveys largely apply only to different-sex couples
- Same-sex couples are made to “fit” into heterosexual constructs
- In some cases, questions only ask about different-sex relationships
Hetero-normative surveys and human subjects

• LGBT people routinely experience social stigma
  ▫ That stigma contributes to a wide range of negative health outcomes

• Surveys that are not sensitive to same-sex relationships can reinforce stigma in LGBT respondents

• IRBs should consider this as a risk to human subjects
The ultimate hetero-normative measurement issue

- Sexual orientation and gender identity are key components in understanding intimate partner relationships
- Very few surveys measure sexual orientation and gender identity
- The lack of such measurement
  - Creates a presumption of heterosexuality among respondents
  - Severely limits the ability of social scientists to make meaningful contribution to public policy debates
Recommendations

• Refocus measurement toward a broader concept of intimate relationships
• Develop methods of measuring relationships that offer greater conceptual clarity
• Develop methods to measure non-marital relationship recognition forms
• Develop accurate methods of measuring different-sex and same-sex relationships
• IRBs should consider hetero-normative relationship measurements as stigmatizing to LGBT respondents
• Include measurement of sexual orientation and gender identity as a standard demographic characteristic