*Note: This is a pre-publication final draft. For the published version, please see: Rafalow, Matthew H. and Kizer, Jessica M. (2018). "Mommy markets: Racial differences in lesbians' dating preferences for women with children." *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 22(3): 297-312.*

Mommy Markets: Racial Differences in Lesbians' Dating Preferences for Women with Children¹

Matthew H. Rafalow
University of California-Irvine

Jessica M. Kizer
Pitzer College

Recent work shows that race is a critical factor in shaping sexual identities, partner preference, and family formation, suggesting there may be racial differences in whether lesbians already have children at the time that they look for companions. In this study, we draw on a sample of 1,923 lesbians on Match.com to quantitatively test whether there are racial differences in dating preferences for women with children, underscoring implications for family inequality through racial differences in who has children when looking for a partner. We find that Blacks, Latinas, and Asians are more likely than Whites to not only have children but also be open to dating other women with children, as well. This suggests race differentially structures lesbians' openness to partners with children, and such preferences may be a possible mechanism for racial stratification.

Recent work in lesbian studies provides a more nuanced portrait of racial differences among lesbians, both in terms of how race shapes sexual identity as well as how it informs when and how families are formed. For example, Moore (2011a; 2011b) offers a contrast to studies of (White) lesbianism by highlighting the significance of race in shaping Black women's sexuality and family formation processes. She finds that the women in her study arrive at their lesbian sexuality later in life after they already had heterosexual relationships. Thus, the most common way to form a family was to bring children from previous heterosexual relationships to their new relationships with other women.

Although this work provides a needed, qualitative vantage point on how race shapes lesbian experience, it is less clear whether these differences in sexual identity and family formation operate at scale, how they might vary beyond Black and White, and how they relate to potential inequalities between groups. For example, a parallel literature on sexuality and partner preferences argues that such daters exhibit biases in their preferences that lead to racial inequalities in partnership outcomes. Among the mechanisms are daters' stated racial preferences: gay men's preferences for some racial groups over others lead to patterns of racial stratification in who dates whom (Rafalow et al., 2017). This literature, however, says very little

¹ We thank Cynthia Feliciano and Belinda Robnett for leading the data collection effort for this project, and Briana Jex for her assistance in this effort. We extend further thanks to Cynthia Feliciano for her contributions to the methods used in this paper, and for developing supporting appendices.

about lesbians beyond the assertion that lesbians state racial preferences less so than do gay men -- and yet, lesbians' partnership outcomes still demographically show patterns of same-race pairing (Lundquist and Lin, 2015). In this paper, we draw on data collected from U.S. daters on Match.com, an online dating platform, to test whether race shapes how lesbians seek out partners. We quantitatively examine not only if there are racial differences among daters in whether they have children but also racial differences in preference for women with children.

Findings suggest that race does indeed shape preference for women with children: Whites are the most likely to exclude women with children, and Blacks, Latinas, and Asians are most likely to be open to women with children. These findings persist even when controlling for other factors, including the dater's presence of children at home, their marital status, or other factors such as their education level or political affiliation. We build on theories of race, sexual identity, and family formation by showing how race may differently shape how families are formed through possible restrictions lesbians have for other women who have children.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In what follows, we chart existing scholarship on race, sexuality, and family formation to set up our study of lesbians' partner preferences for women with children. We first review the literature on race, sexual identity, and family formation, to draw out how recent work shows race differently shapes how women come into their lesbian identities and form families. We then discuss work on partner preferences which suggests that daters may exhibit biases in their preferences that have implications for racial stratification. We join these literatures to hypothesize that there may be racial differences in how women prefer to form families with partners, in that women from some racial groups may be more open to women who already have children than others. As we eventually show, women's preferences for other women with children does vary by race and has implications for racial stratification in the partnership process.

RACE, SEXUAL IDENTITIES, AND FAMILY FORMATION

Recent work on race and sexuality illustrates that race is a critical factor in shaping sexual identities and family formation. This scholarship suggests that there are racial differences in how women come into their lesbian identities and in ways that shape when and how they have children (Moore, 2011c). The bulk of this work so far focuses on differences between White and Black women; research suggests that differences in the history and context in which White and Black women came into their lesbian identities matters for how they meet partners and form families (Moore, 2011b). For example, as White lesbian feminist movements in the 70s increasingly fostered the notion to "come out" as lesbian earlier in the life course, a narrative emerged for partnership among Whites lesbians to fall in love with another woman and then seek out methods to bear a child, including artificial insemination (Gartrell et al., 2005; Patterson, 1992, 1995). This model of starting a family after finding a female partner is today the prevailing approach among White, educated lesbians (Kurdek, 1993; Sullivan, 2004). Therefore, we may expect that White women on the dating market would not actively seek partners who already have children -- instead, they would prefer to date a woman without a child.

Studies of Black lesbianism suggest that the context of their lesbian identities may shape different partner preferences than those of Whites. Whereas White women in the 1970s were typically affiliated with White feminist circles, Blacks largely came to their lesbian identities in

other contexts that were more centrally organized around Black rather than lesbian identity (Abdulahad et al., 1983; Cornwall, 1983; Lorde, 1983; Thorpe, 1996). The political movements of the time that were most compelling to Black women were race movements, and therefore saw race as a primary identity rather than White women's focus on gender and sexuality (King, 1988). In an in-depth ethnographic study, Moore (2011a; 2011b) finds that the Black women in her sample came into their lesbian identities later in life, and in predominantly Black spaces, including bars, nightclubs, and political groups. Because of the timing of their entry into lesbian sexuality, many of the people in her study had relationships with men earlier in their life that resulted in having children. Moore (2011a) argues that family structures for Black women thus may differ from Whites in that Black women are more likely to be in lesbian stepfamilies, or bring children with them into their new relationships with other women. Given these racial differences in the context of lesbian identity, we may expect that Black women on the dating market would be more open to dating women who have children than are White women.

Few studies, if any, examine how racial identity might differently shape family formation beyond Black and White. However, Morris et al. (2002) quantitatively analyze a national survey of lesbians that includes demographic details about whether female partners had a child before or after coming out. They find that Latinas are much more likely than Asian women to have children from a previous relationship with a man. Therefore, we may expect Asian women's preferences to be more similar to White women in that they would prefer to date women without children. We may also expect that Latinas would be similarly open as are Black women to dating women who have children.

PARTNER PREFERENCES AND INEQUALITY

In recent years, scholars of marriage and family have used data from internet dating websites as a means to explore previously unanswerable questions about how partner preferences might shape family formation and inequality. In demonstrating that the internet is now a central means by which people in the U.S., and especially sexual minorities, find partners to date, some argue that many barriers to finding partners, such as geographic limitations that have historically aided in racial segregation, have dissipated (Laumann et al. 2005; Rosenfeld & Thomas, 2012; Wellman, 2001). However, recent research using online dating data shows that daters' own biases shape partner preferences and in ways that lead to racial inequalities in partnership. For example, in their study of heterosexual daters, Robnett & Feliciano (2011) find that racial hierarchies emerge in the racial preferences daters express on the platform. These hierarchies bear out in the demographic patterns of partnership so often cited by those studying interracial relationships.

Although few studies examine lesbian and gay daters' preferences, what exists suggests that gay daters' preferences do indeed inform partnership processes, as well. Most studies of gays focus on men and find that, like heterosexuals, gay men also exhibit racial hierarchies in their preferences (Logan, 2010; Phua & Kaufman, 2003). Although lesbians' preferences are rarely studied, Rafalow et al. (2017) find that lesbians also express racial preferences – though they are less racially selective than are gay men. They argue that gay men occupy a different social position than do lesbians, in that gay men conform more to mainstream ideals of gender and race than do lesbians, which in turn may shape the observed differences in racial preferences.

Despite the fact that lesbians state racial preferences less so than do gay men, demographic outcomes in partnership still show that lesbians exhibit signs of racial segregation as reflected in data on lesbian households (Lundquist & Lin 2015). If not racial preferences, what shapes the resulting segregation found among lesbians? While researchers have studied explicit racial preferences, they have not deeply explored how other types of preferences may have the *effect* of racial stratification in dating despite daters' not actually stating racial preferences, *per se*.

This is where we believe the strength of existing work on race, sexual identities, and family formation helps address a gap in research on lesbians' partner preferences and inequality. This literature suggests that lesbians may vary by race in when and how they come into their lesbian identities, and with effects of whether they have children at the time they find female partners. We therefore connect this work to research on partner preferences and inequality, and examine whether such differences exist by race, both in terms of who, among daters, has children, and what daters' preferences for women with children are. In doing so, we address the limitations of existing work by showing whether racial differences exist among lesbians and, if they do, potentially showing which racial groups would largely be excluded as potential partners through restrictive preferences on a partner's preference of a child.

DATA

We employ a quantitative analysis of data collected in March 2011 from Internet dating profiles posted on Match.com, the leading Internet dating website at the time, with estimates of up to 35 million unique visitors each month (Top 15 Most Popular Dating Websites, 2016). We selected random, stratified samples of daters who self-identified as Black, White, Latino, or Asian living within 50 miles of Los Angeles, Chicago, Atlanta, and New York City. We chose one large city within each major region of the U.S. since historically, racial attitudes have varied widely by region (Firebaugh & Davis, 1988), and so that we could consider cities with high concentrations of same-sex couples² and varied racial compositions. We randomly selected 200 profiles for each race/gender/region combination.³ This paper focuses exclusively on lesbian daters who identify solely as White, Black, Asian or Latina (n=1,923).⁴

Internet dating has become a mainstream activity, and recent survey research finds that Internet daters are not significantly different across demographic characteristics (including

² Each of these cities ranks top 10 in size of their gay populations (Gates, 2006).

³ In March of 2011, research assistants downloaded the first 200 profiles (within each race/gender/region group) sorted by when daters joined the site. This sampling method allowed us to capture daters who are more likely to be active users of the platform and presently seeking partners. Match.com only allowed individuals to search through profiles to find dates. Thus, profiles are available to anyone who creates an account. Because data were sorted based on daters' join date, researchers' own profiles did not affect profile searches. Only profiles with photos were used. We eliminated duplicate profiles, and have no reason to suspect fake profiles in our sample. In some cases, such as Asian women in Atlanta, fewer than 200 profiles in that category were on the website.

⁴ We exclude those who identify with more than one racial-ethnic group to simplify analyses, though we note that a study of multiraciality and lesbians' preferences would be valuable in future work.

gender, race or education) from single Internet users who do not use Internet dating services (Sautter, Tippet, & Morgan, 2010). Moreover, Internet dating is increasingly common and indeed, the *most common* way lesbian couples meet (Rosenfeld & Thomas, 2012). Nevertheless, people who date on the Internet are not a random sample of people who date. Internet users themselves remain a select sample, and this is especially so among Blacks and Latinos (Martin & Robinson, 2007).

In other analyses, we considered that the demographics of Match.com users may differ from the demographics of internet users in these metropolitan areas, and found few differences (see Appendix 1). However, compared to Internet users, Match.com users are more educated. Thus, our findings cannot be generalized beyond the population of U.S. Internet users in four metropolitan areas, who have higher socioeconomic status than the general population. Further, Match.com appears to attract an even more educated (and likely higher-earning) clientele than other dating websites because one must pay to communicate with members. While this limits the generalizability in terms of dating patterns, Match.com is known as a dating website for more serious daters looking for a long-term relationship.⁵ We consider this a strength of this data as racial preferences found here can be considered mechanisms shaping the racial-makeup of lesbian households. Another concern is that daters may not accurately convey their preferences. However, a study of online contact among Internet daters shows that individuals who *state* preferences are more likely to behave per those preferences than those who choose the default profile options (Hitsch, Hortascu, & Ariely, 2010).

Match.com does not impose sexual identity categories. Our sampled daters indicate they are women seeking women. These categories do not necessarily map neatly onto lesbian identities, which minorities may be less likely to adopt (Boellstorff, 2011; Moore, 2011b). Our qualitative analyses of profile data suggests that most daters described themselves as lesbian, with the exception of a small number who identified as bisexual.⁶ However, without the ability to ask daters' directly how they identify, we follow what surfaced in the profile data and refer to women seeking women as lesbians.

Variables

From the profiles, we coded all demographic information about the dater and the characteristics they seek in a date. Daters are asked to state a preference for several characteristics they look for in a date, including the presence of children.

Because previous research has indicated that personal characteristics shape preferences (Feliciano et al., 2011, Glasser et al. 2009; Whyte & Torgler 2017; Wilson et al., 2009), we controlled for the dater's age, region, education, body type, height, political views, and religion

⁵ While unfortunately Match.com does not ask users whether they want a long-term relationship, a search of dating website reviews indicates Match.com is a top dating website for *serious-minded* daters. Also, unlike other competitors, Match.com has always allowed lesbians to seek members of the same sex for dates (Miller, 2008); bloggers and review websites rank Match.com as a top dating website for lesbians (The Top 5 Gay Dating Sites, 2012; Ramsdale, 2014).

⁶ This may be because Match.com, at the time of data collection, did not allow individuals to search for both genders, and therefore bisexuals may be less likely to use the website or identify as such in their profile texts. Further, daters who are trans+ have no other way to express their gender on Match.com given that male and female are the only available categories to select.

(see Table 1 for coding and sample characteristics). We also controlled for how “choosy” the dater was overall, based on the percentage of items for which the dater expressed a preference.

We include two instrumental variables in our selection models, discussed below. First, we include the percentage of characteristics for which the dater states a preference (out of nineteen possible, including not only race/ethnicity, but such characteristics as body type, smoking behavior, and whether they have children; this captures how choosy the dater is about their daters’ characteristics overall (% of preferences). Second, the profiles’ information on 16 possible self-descriptors, including whether the dater has children, wants children, interests and activities, and income. We include a measure of the percentage of self-descriptors that the dater did not answer, leaving the default response, “I’ll tell you later” (% no answers). These instrumental variables are related to whether the dater expresses a preference at all, but not the particular preference for a partner with a child.

METHOD

While we are examining patterns of exclusion in dating for partners with children, we only have information on preferences for daters who explicitly state a preference on their profiles. We consider possible sample selection bias by estimating Heckman (1979) models, using the “heckprob” command in Stata (Heckman, 1979). With this method, two equations are simultaneously estimated: a selection equation indicating whether the dater stated a child preference (vs. the default option of willingness to date “any”), and an outcome equation predicting the exclusion of a particular group (women with children). We use the two identification variables discussed above: percentage of preferences stated and percentage of no answers. We found that $\rho(p)$ —the correlation between the error terms of the two equations—was significant for most of our outcomes, indicating there was selection bias. Thus, all estimates are based on results from probit models with sample selection.⁷

RESULTS

We first examine whether there are racial differences in preference for women with children, and find that such differences do indeed occur. Figure 1 shows that the percentage of

⁷ We have also analyzed the data using two other methods, which scholars have used in previous studies (Feliciano et al., 2009; Feliciano et al., 2011). First, we estimated a multinomial model with three outcomes: no stated preference, excludes women with children group, and includes women with children. We then converted these estimates into predicted probabilities of exclusion of mothers as potential dates. Because this approach considers everyone who states openness to “any” as not excluding women with children, these probabilities are lower than with our approach. However, previous research on internet daters’ behaviors (Hitsch et al., 2010), suggests that this assumption is not warranted. Second, we estimated logistic regression models only on the subsample who stated a preference for children in a potential partner. Predicted probabilities of exclusion drawn from these results are higher than the estimates using our method, which suggests that these results are biased upwards. Consequently, accounting for sample selection bias in this way provides the most unbiased estimates of actual rates of exclusion of women with children among internet lesbian daters. Regardless of the method used, the patterns of exclusion by race are similar (alternate models available upon request).

daters who state a preference for partners with children differ by racial groups, with a greater proportion of Asian and White women excluding women with children than Latinas and Blacks. For instance, about thirty-four percent of Asian women exclude women with children, about nineteen percent of Black women, and about twenty-six percent of Latinas. Likewise, when looking at stated openness to dating women with children, Asians and Whites are the least open to dating women with children, followed by Latinas and Blacks. Almost seven percent of both Asian women and White women are open to dating women with children. Close to seventeen percent of Black women and thirteen percent of Latinas state an openness to women with children.

These findings suggest that there are significant racial differences in openness to dating women with children. The differences between White and Black women align with existing qualitative work on White/Black differences in how racial differences in lesbian identity shape family formation. But these results also highlight new information not discussed in the literature – Asian women also exclude women with children, like White women. Additionally, Latinas' preferences fit somewhat closely with Black women's' preferences.

Figure 2 shows how many of these daters actually have children themselves, as existing work finds that there may be differences by racial-ethnic group and this may shape openness to other partners with children. We first see that most daters do not have children, with more than forty percent of Black, Latina, Asian, and White women stating that they do not have a child. However, there are considerable racial-ethnic differences in whether daters state having a child. Thirty-six percent of Black women note that they have children, followed by twenty-six percent of Latinas, and just under nineteen percent of White women. Only six percent of Asian women reported having a child. By far, a greater proportion of Black women report having a child than do other racial-ethnic groups.

These differences resonate with existing work that compares Black and White women's differences in family structure. Consistent with Moore's (2011a) study of Black women, many Black women daters have a child while they are on the dating market, and White women are less likely to do so. But we also find that Latinas are also on the dating market while caring for a child at high rates, and Asians are significantly less likely than any other racial-ethnic group to do so. Existing work suggests that lesbians' racial context shapes how they come into their sexual identities as well as their path to family formation (Moore, 2011b). These findings, then, could suggest that there are racial-ethnic differences in the context of such identities and how they shape romantic partnership, and especially so between White/Asian women and Latinas/Black women.

Based on a series of probit models with sample selection (see Appendix Table 2 for full models), we calculated predicted probabilities of excluding a potential partner with a child. Table 2 presents these probabilities, which show the likelihood of Latinas and White, Asian, and Black women of excluding women with children taking into consideration other dater characteristics (see Table 1). These characteristics include not only whether the dater has a child of their own, but also possible confounding factors including age, religion, region, politics, and education level. We find that White women are the most exclusionary out of all the groups with a predicted probability of .83 for excluding women with children as potential dates. After controlling for all these other factors, we find that Asians actually exclude women with children as potential dates to a lesser extent than do Black women, .61 as compared to .66. Latinas are slightly more likely to exclude women with children as potential dates, as compared to Black women, .71 as compared to .66. In sum, these findings suggest that there are, indeed, significant differences by

racial-ethnic group in lesbians' openness to dating women with children. Existing work predicted such differences between Black and White women, but we include the fact here that Asians and Latinas exhibit variable patterns in preference for women with children.

DISCUSSION

Using a dataset collected from Match.com, this study suggests that lesbians' openness to dating women with children varies considerably by the dater's racial-ethnic group. Studies suggest that racial differences in how women come into their lesbian identities in turn shapes variation in whether women already have children at the time they pursue partners. This work provided some suggestion as to how differences may emerge between Blacks and Whites, but we also find interesting patterns for Asian and Latina daters, as well. By examining stated preferences that motivate pairings, we argue that some lesbians exhibit biases in their preferences for other women, and differently by race, in ways that affect social opportunities for women seeking partners.

In line with work comparing Black and White women's family structure, we find that Black women are far more likely to be open to dating women with children than are White women, and Black women are also far less likely to exclude women with children than are White women. As Moore (2011b) suggests, this may be because Black and White women come into their lesbian identities at different points in the life course: Black women are more likely to have heterosexual relationships that result in children before they partner with other women. White women, instead, may follow a more mainstream White lesbian narrative that prescribes one to come out first and then find a partner with whom to have children (Gartrell et al., 2005; Kurdek, 1993; Patterson, 1992, 1995; Sullivan, 2004).

Our findings also suggest that Asians are closer to Blacks and Latinas than Whites in their rates of openness to dating women with other children. We find, too, similar pairings of rates of daters stating that they currently have a child. Existing studies of racial preferences find lesbians exhibit different racial preferences depending on their racial affiliation, but the literature provides little indication of how these preferences are implicated with family formation processes. This matters especially because much of the literature on racial preferences is predicated on the assumption that these preferences lead to varying rates of intermarriage and, potentially, mixed families with children. In the absence of in-depth qualitative work that shows how these processes occur, and for Asians and Latinas, especially, we are left to simply observe from our results that there are interesting patterns by racial group in terms of lesbians' preferences for women with children. Asians, Blacks, and Latinas are closer in their preferences than they are with Whites. Further qualitative work is clearly needed to explicate the patterns we find here for Asians and Latinas and link them to existing in-depth work on other groups of lesbians (Moore, 2011a; 2011b).

This study has a number of limitations that would benefit from follow-up research. A methodological limitation is that our dataset only includes major U.S. cities. While we believe studying these cities is helpful in that these are locations where lesbians have historically congregated, we know that this excludes us from considering possible regional variation worth exploring in future studies. Another methodological limitation is that we are unable to distinguish between women who identify as bisexual and those who identify as lesbian, and thus we are unable to parse out how these two groups may differ in their preferences.

Despite these limitations, we believe this work charts a new direction at the intersection of literatures on both race, sexuality, and family formation, as well as partner preferences and related inequalities. First, lesbians' preferences operating at this locus of inequality have not been studied at this scale before, thus building on extant qualitative research limited to Black/White differences among women. Research on dating and inequality largely does not consider lesbians in analyses, and when scholars do they find that lesbians are less likely to exhibit racial preferences when dating than gay men and heterosexuals (Rafalow et al., 2017). Yet, demographic work shows that lesbians' partnership outcomes are quite racially homogenous (Lundquist & Lin, 2016). If lesbians do not explicitly state racial preferences, how is it that racial segregation still occurs through partnership?

In deriving our hypotheses from work on race, sexual identity, and family formation and testing them against a dataset on dating preferences, we show that lesbians' preferences for women with children are a potential mechanism that drives racial stratification in partnership and family formation. For example, if White women are seeking partners with whom to have children, they will inevitably exclude many Latinas and Asian and Black women as potential partners. White women may even be open to dating Latinas and Asian and Black women, but by excluding women with children they inevitably replicate racial divides. Racial divides in dating may persist among lesbians not simply due to racial preferences, as recently described in the literature (Rafalow et al., 2017), but also due to differences in preference for family structure that align with daters' racial-ethnic origin. The racial context in which lesbians come to their sexual identities thus may have implications not just for whether their future partners already have children or not, but also for patterns of racial homophily among lesbians.

REFERENCES

- Abdulahad, T., Rogers, G., Smith, B., & Waheed, J. (1983). Black lesbian/feminist organizing: A conversation. In B. Smith (Ed.), *Home girls: A Black feminist anthology* (pp. 293–319). New York: Kitchen Table Press.
- Boellstorff, T. (2011). But do not identify as gay: A proleptic genealogy of the MSM category. *Cultural Anthropology*, 26(2), 287-312.
- Cornwall, A. (1983). *The Black lesbian in White America*. Tallahassee: Naiad Press.
- Feliciano, C., Robnett, B., & Komaie, G. (2009). Gendered racial exclusion among white internet daters. *Social Science Research*, 38(1), 39-54.
- Feliciano, C., Lee, R., & Robnett, B. (2011). Racial boundaries among Latinos: Evidence from Internet daters' racial preferences. *Social Problems*, 58(2), 189-212.
- Firebaugh, G., & Davis, K. E. (1988). Trends in antiblack prejudice, 1972-1984: Region and cohort effects. *American Journal of Sociology*, 251-272.
- Gartrell, N., A. Deck, C. Rodas., & Peyser. H. (2005). The National Lesbian Family Study: 4. Interviews with the 10-Year-Old Children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 75(4), 518-24.
- Gates, G. J. (2006). Same-sex couples and the gay, lesbian, bisexual population: New estimates from the American Community Survey. *The Williams Institute*.
- Glasser, C.L., Robnett, B., & Feliciano. C. (2009). Internet Daters' Body Type Preferences: Race-Ethnic and Gender Differences. *Sex Roles*. 61,14-33.
- Heckman, J.J. (1979). Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error. *Econometrica*, 47(1), 153-61.
- Hitsch, G. J., Hortaçsu, A., & Ariely, D. (2010). What makes you click?—Mate preferences in online dating. *Quantitative marketing and Economics*, 8(4), 393-427.
- King, D. (1988). Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: The context of a Black feminist ideology. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 14, 42– 72.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1993). The Allocation of Household Labor in Gay, Lesbian, Heterosexual and Married Couples. *Journal of Social Issues* 49(3), 127-39.
- Laumann, E. O., Ellingson, S. E., Mahay, J. E., Paik, A. E., & Youm, Y. E. (2004). *The Sexual Organization of the City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Logan, T. D. (2010). Personal characteristics, sexual behaviors, and male sex work a quantitative approach. *American sociological review*, 75(5), 679-704.
- Lorde, A. (1983). Tar beach. In B. Smith (Ed.), *Home girls: A Black feminist anthology* (pp. 148–158). New York: Kitchen Table Press.
- Lundquist, J. H., & Lin, K. H. (2015). Is Love (Color) Blind? The Economy of Race among Gay and Straight Daters. *Social Forces* 93(4), 1423-1449.
- Martin, S. P., & Robinson, J. P. (2007). The income digital divide: Trends and predictions for levels of Internet use. *Social Problems*, 54(1), 1-22.
- Miller, Joshua R. (2008). eHarmony to Provide Gay Dating Service After Lawsuit. *Fox News*. <<http://www.foxnews.com/story/2008/11/20/eharmony-to-provide-gay-dating-service>>
- Moore, M. R. (2011a). Gendered Power Relations among Women: A Study of Household Decision Making in Black, Lesbian Stepfamilies. *American Sociological Review*, 73(2), 335-356.
- Moore, M. R. (2011b). Two sides of the same coin: Revising analyses of lesbian sexuality and family formation through the study of Black women. *Journal of lesbian studies*, 15(1), 58-68.

- Moore, M. R. (2011c). *Invisible Families: Gay identities, relationships, and motherhood among Black women*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Morris, J. F., Balsam, K., & Rothblum, E. (2002). Lesbian and bisexual mothers and nonmothers: Demographics and the coming out process. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16, 144–156.
- Patterson, C. (1992). Children of Lesbian and Gay Parents. *Child Development* 63(5), 1025-42.
- Patterson, C. (1995). Families of the Lesbian Baby Boom: Parents' Division of Labor and Children's Adjustment. *Developmental Psychology* 31(1), 115-23.
- Phua, V. C., & Kaufman, G. (2003). The crossroads of race and sexuality date selection among men in Internet "personal" ads. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(8), 981-994.
- Rafalow, M.H., Feliciano, C., & Robnett, B. (2017). Racialized Femininity and Masculinity in the Preferences of Online Same-Sex Daters. *Social Currents* 4(4), 306-321.
- Ramsdale, S. (2014). Online Dating: The 11 Best Sites. *Marie Claire*. Retrieved October 25, 2014 (<http://www.marieclaire.co.uk/blogs/suzannah-ramsdale/541693/online-dating-the-11-best-sites.html>).
- Robnett, B., & Feliciano, C. (2011). Patterns of racial-ethnic exclusion by internet daters. *Social Forces*, 89(3), 807-828.
- Rosenfeld, M. J., & Thomas, R. J. (2012). Searching for a mate the rise of the internet as a social intermediary. *American Sociological Review*, 77(4), 523-547.
- Sullivan, M. (2004). *The Family of Woman: Lesbian Mothers, Their Children, and the Undoing of Gender*. Berkeley, CA: California Press.
- Thorpe, R. (1996). "A house where queers go": African-American lesbian nightlife in Detroit, 1940–1975. In E. Lewin (Ed.), *Inventing lesbian cultures in America* (pp. 40–61). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Top 15 Most Popular Dating Websites. December 2016. (n.d.). Retrieved December 30, 2016, from <http://www.ebizmba.com/articles/dating-websites>
- The Top 5 Gay Dating Sites. (2012). Retrieved October 25, 2014, from <http://www.him-magazine.com/2012/01/01/the-top-5-gay-dating-sites/>
- Wellman, B. (2001). Physical place and cyber-place: The rise of networked individualism. *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research*, 25, 227-52.
- Whyte, S., & Torgler, B. (2017). Things change with age: Educational assortment in online dating. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 109, 5-11.
- Wilson, B. D. M. (2009). Black lesbian gender and sexual culture: Celebration and resistance. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 11, 297–313.

Note: Daters with no stated preference are not shown to simplify the chart, but with their inclusion, the stacked columns add up to 100 percent.

Note: Daters who did not respond to this question are not shown to simplify the chart, but with their inclusion, the stacked columns add up to 100 percent.

Table 1. Sample Statistics of Gay Women Daters

Race (%)		
White		34.48
Black		29.69
Latino		22.26
Asian/Pacific Islander		13.57
 Preference for Partner's Children (%)		
Excludes partners with children		27.09
Prefers partners with children		11.49
Any		61.41
 Presence of Children (%)		
Has children		23.92
Does not have kids		63.75
Missing		12.32
 Marital Status (%)		
Never married		80.97
Separated		5.62
Divorced		9.83
Widowed		1.25
Any/Missing		2.34
 Metropolitan Area (%)		
Los Angeles		30.32
New York		24.75
Chicago		23.82
Atlanta		21.11
 Education (%)		
High school or less		14.25
Some college		38.12
College graduate		19.71
Post graduate		12.48
Education missing		15.44
 Body Type (%)		

Average	33.28
Slender	14.56
Athletic and toned	16.59
Plus size	30.58
Any/Missing	4.99
Political views (%)	
Conservative	2.5
Middle of the road/non-conformist	45.66
Liberal	22.88
Some other viewpoint	8.89
Missing/no answer	20.07
Religion (%)	
Agnostic/Atheist/spiritual	25.22
Buddhist/Taoist/Hindu/Muslim/other	6.24
Christian/Jewish	42.49
Religion missing/no answer	26.05
Age (mean)	31.54
	(10.34)
Height (mean)	64.65
	(4.54)
Preferences for other characteristics (%)	
Overall choosiness (% of preferences)	45.06
Faith	24.75
Education	40.67
Body	59.02
<hr/>	
N	1,923

Table 2. Predicted Probabilities of Exclusion of Partners with Children

	Excludes Women with Children	
White	0.83***	(0.08)
Asian	0.61***	(0.13)
Black	0.66***	(0.12)
Latino	0.71***	(0.11)

N=1,923

Note: Based on full Heckman probit regression model for in New York, Christian or Jewish, middle-of-the-road politics, average body type, no preferences for religion or education, never been married and age, height, and presence of children set at means. Standard errors in parentheses.

Appendix Table 1. Racial Composition of Four Metropolitan Areas in Current Population Survey as Compared with Match.com, Percentages

	LA			NY			Chicago			Atlanta		
	CPS 18+, single	CPS 18+, single, internet users	match.com - all*	CPS 18+, single	CPS 18+, single, internet users	match.com - all*	CPS 18+, single	CPS 18+, single, internet users	match.com - all*	CPS 18+, single	CPS 18+, single, internet users	match.com - all*
MALES												
White	0.38	0.44	0.48	0.44	0.49	0.51	0.56	0.62	0.62	0.51	0.54	0.59
Black	0.11	0.09	0.02	0.20	0.18	0.10	0.22	0.19	0.10	0.35	0.32	0.22
Asian	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.01
Hispanic	0.43	0.36	0.25	0.28	0.24	0.11	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.10	0.07	0.05
Other	0.01	0.02	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.13
N	2941	2260	200	4080	3236	200	2072	1573	200	1086	866	200
FEMALES												
White	0.38	0.44	0.44	0.47	0.50	0.57	0.56	0.63	0.64	0.45	0.50	0.55
Black	0.11	0.08	0.12	0.24	0.22	0.10	0.27	0.21	0.18	0.45	0.41	0.33
Asian	0.11	0.13	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.03
Hispanic	0.39	0.34	0.20	0.22	0.19	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.05
Other	0.01	0.01	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.01	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.01	0.04
N	3194	2442	200	4789	3654	200	2245	1657	200	1164	946	200

Sources: Current Population Survey Computer and Internet Use Supplement, October 2009 & 2010, Match.com random sample drawn in 2011.

Notes: CPS data are weighted to provide population estimates of percentages within each metropolitan area; * Match.com data are weighted so that lesbians and gays account for the approximate % in the general populations of these areas based on estimates from Gates (2006)

Appendix Table 2. Coefficients from Heckman Probit Regression Models
Predicting Exclusion of Partners with Children

Racial Self-Identity: White (reference)	Exclude Partners with Children		Selection Model	
Asian	-0.70**	(0.22)	0.11	(0.13)
Black	-0.55**	(0.18)	0.06	(0.11)
Latino	-0.41*	(0.185)	0.01	(0.11)
Presence of Children: Does not have children (reference)				
	-			
Has children	1.40***	(0.17)	-0.19	(0.11)
	-			
No answer/missing	0.93***	(0.22)	-0.40*	(0.18)
Marital Status: Never married (reference)				
Separated	-0.26	(0.32)	-0.25	(0.19)
Divorced	-0.18	(0.23)	-0.13	(0.14)
Widow/Widower	0.58	(0.48)	0.49	(0.35)
No answer/missing	-0.15	(0.35)	0.64*	(0.30)
Education: Some college/Associate's degree (reference)				
High school graduate or less	-0.09	(0.18)	0.00	(0.12)
Bachelor's degree	0.40*	(0.19)	0.10	(0.15)
Post-graduate degree	0.36	(0.21)	0.01	(0.16)
No answer/missing	-0.15	(0.20)	-0.23	(0.16)
Region: Los Angeles (reference)				
New York	-0.05	(0.16)	0.07	(0.10)
Chicago	-0.28	(0.18)	-0.09	(0.10)
Atlanta	-0.57**	(0.19)	-0.04	(0.12)
Politics: Middle of the road (reference)				
Conservative	0.32	(0.44)	0.06	(0.27)
Liberal	0.40*	(0.17)	0.07	(0.28)
Some other viewpoint	0.05	(0.21)	0.16	(0.29)
No answer/missing	0.26	(0.19)	0.10	(0.30)
Religion: Christian/Jewish (reference)				
Agnostic/atheist/spiritual	0.16	(0.15)	-0.09	(0.17)
Buddhist/Taoist/Hindu/Muslim	0.21	(0.24)	-0.18	(0.10)

No answer/missing	-0.10	(0.17)	-0.03	(0.12)
<hr/> Body type: Average (reference)				
Slender	0.36	(0.22)	-0.03	(0.11)
Athletic and toned	0.08	(0.18)	-0.07	(0.10)
Plus size	-0.17	(0.15)	0.12	(0.20)
No answer/missing	0.36	(0.31)		
<hr/>				
Age	-			
	0.05***	(0.01)	-0.01**	(0.00)
Height	-0.01	(0.01)	-0.01	(0.01)
<hr/>				
Stated preference for religion	-0.16	(0.15)	-	
			0.49***	(0.11)
<hr/>				
Stated Preference for education	-0.21	(0.15)	-	
			0.52***	(0.10)
<hr/>				
Stated Preference for body	0.39*	(0.16)	-	
			0.59***	(0.10)
<hr/>				
% no answer			0.00	(0.01)
Total preferences			0.08***	(0.00)
<hr/>				
rho			0.14	
Test for independent equations, Prob>chi2			0.37	
<hr/>				
N = 1,923 (742 uncensored)				
Note: Standard errors in parentheses.				