PATTERNS OF SAME-SEX PARTNERING IN METROPOLITAN AND NONMETROPOLITAN AMERICA pdf

1: Same-sex partners : the social demography of sexual orientation (Book,) [www.enganchecubano.com]

Patterns of Same-Sex Partnering in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan America 3. The Residential Segregation of Gay Males and Lesbians from Heterosexuals.

See Table S1 in Supplementary Material for each of the four ratios for each of the metropolitan areas. The mean across the metropolitan areas for gay male households is 0. The value for the San Francisco area may be interpreted as indicating that a gay male couple is 2. Ten highest ratios of gay male couples, lesbian couples, opposite-sex married couples, and opposite-sex cohabiting couples: Ten lowest ratios of gay male couples, lesbian couples, opposite-sex married couples and opposite-sex cohabiting couples: For comparative purposes, we also present in Table 1 descriptive data for ratios for opposite-sex couples. The average metropolitan area has a ratio value of 1. This means that the average metro area is just about as likely to have an opposite-sex married couple or an opposite-sex cohabiting couple residing there as it would be likely to have a randomly selected couple from a metro household residing there. Of all the metro areas, the Provoâ€"Orem, UT area is the most likely to have an opposite-sex married couple located there, with a ratio value of 1. And the Lewistonâ€"Auburn, ME area is the most likely of all the metro areas to have an opposite-sex cohabiting couple residing there Table 2. The metro areas with the lowest opposite-sex ratios are the Gainesville, FL metro area with an opposite-sex married couples value of 0. Table 2 reports the 10 highest ratios and Table 3 the 10 lowest ratios for same-sex male and lesbian partnering. Five metro areas are among the top 10 areas for both the gay male and lesbian ratios. There are also some similarities among the metro areas with respect to the lowest gay male and lesbian ratios Table 3 , but there are not as many metro areas among the 10 with the lowest values as there are among the 10 with the highest values, 3 versus 5. Variation in the Four Partnering Ratios Across the Metropolitan Areas We now compare the degree to which these four sets of partnering indexes gay males, lesbians, opposite-sex married, and opposite-sex cohabiting vary across the metropolitan areas. Since the means for the four ratios are very different see Table 1 , we should not compare their respective SDs. The CRV is especially useful and preferred over the straightforward SD when one wishes to compare the levels of dispersion of data with different means. The CRVs for the two same-sex ratios are 0. As one might expect, there is clearly much greater relative variation across the metro areas in both of the same-sex partnering indexes, with the opposite-sex cohabiting index values having the next highest amount of relative variation, and the opposite-sex married index values showing the lowest amount. In Figure 2 , we present a scatterplot comparing for the metropolitan areas in the prevalence indexes for gay male partners with those for lesbian partners. The diagonal line in the figure is not a regression line, but, rather, a line representing equal gay male and lesbian partnering ratio index values. Observations above the diagonal line refer to areas with higher gay male ratios than lesbian ratios; and vice versa for observations below the line. Scatterplot comparing ratio index values for gay male couples with ratio index values for lesbian couples: However, we also see in Figure 2 that in most metropolitan areas the prevalence ratios for lesbian partners are higher than those for male partners. That is, most of the metropolitan areas are located below the diagonal line in Figure 2 , meaning that their lesbian ratios are greater than their gay male ratios. To illustrate, we have identified by name the observation for the Ithaca metro area; its lesbian ratio is 2. Also identified in Figure 2 is the Santa Fe area, with a lesbian ratio of 2. By contrast, the San Francisco metro area has a gay male ratio of 2. Gay males, thus, appear to have a few favorite metropolitan areas, namely San Francisco, Atlanta, Los Angeles, Miami, Washington, DC, New York, Houston, and the other areas mentioned above where their prevalence ratios surpass those of lesbians. Partnered lesbians, on the other hand, tend to have concentrations that are greater than those of gay males in most of the metropolitan areas, tending not to prefer certain metropolitan areas to the degree they are preferred by gay males. We turn now to the issue of accounting for variation in the indexes of gay male and lesbian partnering. Among the metropolitan areas, why, for instance, do San Francisco and Miami have the highest gay male partnering indexes, and why do Ithaca and Santa Fe

have the highest lesbian ratios see Table 2? Why do Grand Forks and Bismarck have the lowest gay male partnering ratios, and why do Wausau and Provoâ€"Orem have the lowest lesbian ratios see Table 3? What kinds of social and ecological characteristics of the metropolitan areas might be brought to bear to answer these questions? In this section, we draw on sociological human ecology and a literature dealing with gay and lesbian settlement patterns to identify characteristics of metropolitan areas that one could be related to levels of gay male and lesbian concentration; we then propose and test a number of hypotheses in an attempt to address this issue. There is good reason to expect higher levels of gay and lesbian concentration in areas with larger populations Abrahamson, ; Gates and Ost, ; Walther et al. These expectations are based in part on the notion that the larger the size of the general population, the greater the likelihood for some of the residents to be gay males and lesbians. Also, we have reason to expect that levels of gay male and lesbian concentration should be positively associated with levels of heterosexual cohabitation. If the social and political climate of a metropolitan area is conducive to heterosexual cohabitation, then one might argue that the same should be the case for homosexual cohabitation Black et al. Metro areas that are more accepting of heterosexual unmarried couples who are living together should be more accepting of gay males and lesbians living together. These so-called more accepting populations will likely be politically and socially more liberal, or less conservative, than populations less accepting of heterosexual cohabitants. Metro areas with large college populations, e. Thus, metropolitan areas with a high prevalence of unmarried heterosexuals who are cohabiting should have a high prevalence of homosexual cohabitation, and vice versa. We also hypothesize that the median age of the population in the metro area should be associated in a negative manner with levels of gay male and lesbian concentration. Given that much older populations tend to be more conservative than younger populations, we expect that the higher the median age of the population, the lower the level of same-sex partnering Florida, , We also expect that the mode of household occupancy should be associated with the prevalence of same-sex partnering. Among the metropolitan areas, we hypothesize that the higher the percentage of households that are renter occupied, the higher the prevalence of gay male and lesbian partnering. This hypothesis is based in part on the fact that rental housing tends to be more associated with a more mobile and dynamic, i. Finally, we expect that the higher the percentages of African Americans and Latinos in the populations, the larger the presence of same-sex partnering. The first two columns of Table 4 present the results of two ordinary least squares OLS multiple regression equations modeling the prevalence of gay male partners and lesbian partners among the metropolitan areas. Standardized regression coefficients from four multiple regression equations of same-sex gay male partnering ratios, same-sex lesbian partnering ratios, opposite-sex married partnering ratios, and opposite-sex cohabiting partnering ratios, on six independent variables: We note first that the statistical tolerances of the six independent variables are all acceptable. In the gay male and lesbian equations, the tolerances range from a low of 0. The mean tolerance of the six independent variables in the metro area equations is 0. Multicollinearity does not appear to be an issue in any of the equations presented in Table 4. Looking at the standardized regression coefficient results across the metropolitan areas predicting levels of gay male concentration left panel of data of Table 4 , four are signed in the hypothesized direction, and all four of them are statistically significant. The larger the concentration of renter-occupied housing, and the larger the percentage of Latinos in the metropolitan area, the higher the gay male partnering ratio. Also, the higher the prevalence of unmarried cohabitation and the larger the population size, the higher the gay male partnering ratio. The median age variable, however, is related positively, not negatively as hypothesized, with same-sex male prevalence. And the percentage Black variable is not signed as hypothesized, and it is also not statistically significant. The renter variable has the largest standardized coefficient; for every one SD increase in the percentage of the metro area population in rental housing, there is a 0. The population size variable has the next strongest effect on the gay male ratio. We next look at the regression results predicting among the metropolitan areas the prevalence of lesbian partnering. With only one difference from the results for the gay male equation, those for the lesbian equation are the same. The higher the prevalence of unmarried cohabitation and the larger the population size, the higher the lesbian partnering ratio. And the larger the

concentration of renter-occupied housing in the metro area, the higher the lesbian partnering ratio. Also, as was the situation in the gay male equation, the renter variable has the strongest relative effect on the lesbian partnering ratio of all six independent variables. For every one SD increase in the rental housing variable, there is a 0.

PATTERNS OF SAME-SEX PARTNERING IN METROPOLITAN AND NONMETROPOLITAN AMERICA pdf

2: Choices Article - Bridging the Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan Digital Divide in Home Internet Use

Same-sex partnering data in the U.S. census: an overview --Patterns of same-sex partnering in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan America --The residential segregation of gay males and lesbians from heterosexuals --Gay male and lesbian enclaves in the San Francisco Bay area --Factors affecting the migration decision of gay men and lesbians.

This article has been cited by other articles in PMC. Abstract Background In the United States, male-to-male sexual transmission accounts for the greatest number of new human immunodeficiency virus HIV diagnoses and a substantial number of sexually transmitted infections STI annually. However, the prevalence and annual incidence of HIV and other STIs among men who have sex with men MSM cannot be estimated in local contexts because demographic data on sexual behavior, particularly same-sex behavior, are not routinely collected by large-scale surveys that allow analysis at state, county, or finer levels, such as the US decennial census or the American Community Survey ACS. Therefore, techniques for indirectly estimating population sizes of MSM are necessary to supply denominators for rates at various geographic levels. Objective Our objectives were to indirectly estimate MSM population sizes at the county level to incorporate recent data estimates and to aggregate county-level estimates to states and core-based statistical areas CBSAs. We then used this weight to adjust the urbanicity-stratified percentage of adult men who had sex with a man in the past year, according to estimates derived from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey NHANES , for each county. We multiplied the weighted percentages by the number of adult men in each county to estimate its number of MSM, summing county-level estimates to create state- and CBSA-level estimates. Results We found that the percentage of MSM among adult men ranged from 1. Among counties with over , residents, the five highest county-level percentages of MSM were San Francisco County, California at Conclusions We used a new method to generate small-area estimates of MSM populations, incorporating prior work, recent data, and urbanicity-specific parameters. We also used an imputation approach to estimate MSM in rural areas, where same-sex sexual behavior may be underreported. Our approach yielded estimates of MSM population sizes within states, counties, and metropolitan areas in the United States, which provide denominators for calculation of HIV and STI prevalence and incidence at those geographic levels. Prior work on estimating the population size of MSM in the United States [2 - 5] and at the city [6] and state [3 , 7 - 10] levels show that prevalence and incidence rates of HIV and some sexually transmitted infections STIs are higher among MSM than other groups. In order to estimate the prevalence or incidence rates of HIV or other STIs among MSM in additional areas, we need to estimate the denominator of population size [2]. Having male sex partners is not necessarily the same as self-identification as gay, bisexual, or queer. MSM defines a group of men behaviorally and temporally, and is preferred by public health researchers over identities such as gay or bisexual men because behavior, not identity, leads to sexual transmission of HIV and STIs. Many MSM self-identify as gay or bisexual, but not all. Thus, reports such as a recent Gallup publication [11] that estimate population sizes of lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender LGBT individuals have limited use for public health. The choice of timeframe influences the estimated percentage of MSM among adult men, and consequently, the estimated size of the MSM population. Data regarding cohabitating same-sex partners are collected by the US Census Bureau, but behavioral data on same-sex behavior among men are not. The most recent effort to synthesize data from multiple studies in order to estimate the percentage of MSM among adult men in the United States comes from a meta-analysis of these and other data sources by Purcell and colleagues [2]. However, given uneven geographic dispersion of MSM in the United States, national estimates are inadequate for state and local prevention planning. Examining HIV prevalence and incidence at smaller geographic levels, and comparing HIV burden among MSM in different areas, requires estimation approaches at finer levels. Several methods have been proposed to estimate state and local population sizes of MSM. Some researchers begin with HIV prevalence assumptions and work backward to determine the population size of MSM in a given area. Other researchers have used data from the US Census Bureau and from large,

national health surveys to generate state [3 , 7 , 10] and county [9 , 17 - 19] MSM population estimates. Lieb and colleagues [10] proposed two models to estimate state population sizes for MSM. The first, Model A, assumes different percentages of MSM among men in urban, suburban, and rural areas. For those percentages, Lieb et al. They then multiply these weighted percentages by the population in each state, again taken from the midyear population estimates. The final state estimates are the mean of Models A and B. Our approach uses elements of Lieb et al. By estimating population sizes at smaller geographic levels and within urbanicity strata, we hope to provide public health practitioners and policy makers with a useful tool for determining disease burden and allocating resources at state and county levels, including among nonurban areas. Methods Data We used data from the ACS 5-year summary file, to , to obtain the total number of households, total number of SSM households male householder and male partner , and total number of men aged 18 years and older for each county in the United States Multimedia Appendix 1 [21]. The ACS is a supplement to the decennial census that provides annual updates to housing and demographic statistics for the United States [23]. Approximately 1 in 38 US households are randomly sampled each year, and the selected individuals respond using either Web-based or paper questionnaires. Staff from the US Census Bureau follow up with individuals who do not respond, in order to improve response rates. The 1- and 3-year summary files are limited to areas with populations of 65, or 20, or more, respectively. However, the 5-year ACS summary files contain data at all available geographic areas. We did not include data from US territories. According to the NCHS classification scheme, counties fall into six categories: In order to incorporate urbanicity-specific percentages of MSM among adult men, we then collapsed the categories according to the four-level urbanicity classification used by Oster et al. Analysis We developed a method to estimate small-area MSM populations by combining two models reported by Lieb et al. The first, Model A, applied estimates of the percentage of MSM among adult men, stratified by urbanicity, to the adult male population. We combined these two models into a single model by stratifying the MSM Index formula to determine the urbanicity-specific relative representation of SSM households Figure 1 , Equation 1.

PATTERNS OF SAME-SEX PARTNERING IN METROPOLITAN AND NONMETROPOLITAN AMERICA pdf

3: The American Marketplace: Demographics and Spending Patterns, 14th ed â€“ New Strategist Press

Geographic patterns of settlement vary dramatically across the United States, ranging from the intense concentrations of people and built structures in large metropolitan areas that serve as centers of decision making, production, and distribution, to regions that are nearly void of human habitation.

Whitacre and Bradford F. Mills During the s, an increasing share of US households became digitally connected to the vast amount of information available on the Internet. United States Bureau of Census data indicate that between August and September alone, the percentage of all households with Internet connections increased dramatically Figure 1. At the same time, disparities in Internet access and use emerged among various segments of the population. As a result, the digital divide has been the focus of several policy initiatives. The Rural Access Authority in North Carolina, for example, was created to provide local dial-up Internet access from every telephone exchange in the state. Other states such as Washington and Virginia have provided grants to rural areas to promote high-speed Internet access. Other initiatives have supported infrastructure investments in low-density regions. These policies will only stimulate home Internet use in nonmetropolitan areas if the current digital divide stems from differences in infrastructure for Internet connectivity between the two areas. Digital infrastructure between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas can differ considerably. Greenman reports that less than one percent of towns with fewer than 10, persons have digital subscriber line DSL or cable modem services. The Current Population Survey CPS data also suggest that infrastructure differences may be contributing to the digital divide. Differences in education, income, and other household attributes, rather than technology, may drive differences in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan region use. In this case, closing the divide would involve broader efforts to increase education and income in nonmetropolitan areas. Ensuring school children equal access to digital technology is also essential to avoid passing digital knowledge gaps to the next generation. We next explore how differences in education, income, and other household attributes influence the digital divide in home Internet use. The Role of Income and Education Nonmetropolitan areas trail metropolitan areas in both household income and household head education Figure 3. Income and education levels are also higher in Internet-using households Figure 4. Thus, income and education levels are likely to explain much of the digital divide. Adding regional density of home Internet use along with household characteristics explains Thus, household attributes and regional rates of household Internet use account for most of the digital divide. Regional differences in Internet use could decline over time because of normal adoption patterns. The current findings, however, about the importance of differences in income and education on Internet use suggest greater persistence in the gap. Policy Implications Policy options to address the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan digital divide must be linked to the narrowing of income and educational disparities rather than focusing solely on digital infrastructure. Programs to increase general access for underserved populations also are important. Public support for such initiatives is currently weak. The two major federal program initiatives The Technology Opportunities Program and Community Technology Centers to foster Internet use by underserved populations are losing their funding Harris and Associates, Similarly, the CPS data indicate that the current rate of Internet use by children at school is higher in nonmetropolitan areas than in metropolitan areas. School access is considered essential to avoid transferring the digital divide to future generations. A similar commitment to reduce disparities within the adult population is a policy choice. Notes 1 This paper uses US Census designations of nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties to compare differences in home Internet use. Metropolitan counties generally have populations greater than , 75, in New England or a town or city of at least 50, Nonmetropolitan counties are those counties not classified as metropolitan. For More Information Compaine, B. Facing a crisis or creating a myth? New policies for a new rural America. International Regional Science Review, 24 1 , Life in the slow lane: Rural residents are frustrated by sluggish web Access and a scarcity of local information online. New York Times, p. Bringing a nation online: The importance of federal leadership. Leslie Harris and Associates. Networks that

nurture long-distance relationships and local ties. Available on the World Wide Web: Falling through the net: United States Department of Commerce. How Americans are expanding their use of the internet. Current population survey, September Internet and computer use supplement [computer file]. Figure 1 Household internet use for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas in and Current Population Survey Internet and Computer Use Supplements, Figure 2 High speed and long distance access for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas. Current Population Survey Internet and Computer Use Supplements, Figure 3 Household head education and household income levels in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas. Current Population Survey Internet and Computer Use Supplements, Figure 4 Household head education and household income levels for home internet users and nonusers. Articles may be reproduced or electronically distributed as long as attribution to Choices and the American Agricultural Economics Association is maintained.

4: Same-sex partners : the demography of sexual orientation (eBook,) [www.enganchecubano.com]

Download Migration and Geographic Mobility in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan America: to [PDF - < MB] Geographic mobility has long been an important aspect of American life, directly affecting both people and geographic areas.

5: Same-Sex Partners

patterns of gay male partnering and lesbian partnering in the states and metropolitan areas of the United States. We first discuss the quality of the same-sex partnering data from the U.S.

6: Rural and Urban Trends in Family and Intimate Partner Homicide in the United States,

Red and Blue America has become the spatial metaphor for an electoral divide on two main dimensions - a nonmetropolitan Red and a larger metropolitan Blue, and a traditionalist Red and a more modern Blue.

7: National Prevention Information Network - Technical Information and Communications Branch

In nonmetropolitan areas, there are different trends in family formation patterns compared to metropolitan areas which ultimately could affect child economic-well being. Interestingly, there is not a difference in rates of cohabitation between nonmetropolitan and.

PATTERNS OF SAME-SEX PARTNERING IN METROPOLITAN AND NONMETROPOLITAN AMERICA pdf

Ahmed and the oblivion machines Bridges: Meanderings of a moderately muddled mind U.S. Econ Demystified Trauma and Sexuality Life finds a way: monstrous maternities and the quantum gaze in Jurassic Park and The thirteenth warrior The holy office of the inquisition and women Jacqueline Holler Arizona: Peach Springs : 1:100,000-scale topographic map Hypnosis and the unity of consciousness Tim Bayne Widescreen cinema Law-decree no. 1526, July 8, 1954 Asm handbook volume 3 alloy phase diagrams Lets Try It Out with Towers and Bridges The place of Latin in secondary education [by E. D. M. Gray. Service tecumseh engine lev 120 36200 Aquarium Plant Paradise Observation and Reconnaissance 415 The caprice of charity : geographical variations in the finances of British voluntary hospital services b A Sea of Broken Hearts New contents, new teachers, new publics Visioning our way to healthy relations hasnt worked Life Teachings of Christ (Vol. 2) Questions On Psychology, Metaphysics And Ethics Women, marriage, and the nation-state: the rise of nonconsensual bride kidnapping in post-Soviet Kazakhst The rule of four ian caldwell Web hosting reseller business plan Part 4. Gene Expression The modern impulse of traditional Judaism Insurance institutes in Australia, 1884-1984 The age of asphalt Ethereals Offerings Global Reformation U.S. border security Chevrolet Venture Oldsmobile Silhouette Pontiac Trans Sport and Montana Frogs Eggs (Read All About It-Science) 16 biology darwins theory of evolution assessment Lawlessness and Economics Ch. 11. Chaos/appearance/Baroque Richard Reddaway VI The Order of the Ceremonies of the Public Baptism of Adults 117 Sea-mountain, fire city Take Each Day One Step at a Time