Using data from the U.S. Census Bureau, this report provides demographic and economic information about same-sex couples and same-sex couples raising children in Nebraska. We compare same-sex “unmarried partners,” which the Census Bureau defines as an unmarried couple who “shares living quarters and has a close personal relationship,” to different-sex married couples in Nebraska.1

In many ways, the almost 4,000 same-sex couples living in Nebraska are similar to married couples. According to Census 2000, they live throughout the State, are racially and ethnically diverse, have partners who depend upon one another financially, and actively participate in Nebraska's economy. Census data also show that 30% of same-sex couples in Nebraska are raising children. However, same-sex couples with children have fewer economic resources to provide for their families than married parents: they have lower household incomes and lower rates of homeownership.

SAME-SEX COUPLES AND THE LGB POPULATION IN NEBRASKA

- In 2000, there were 2,332 same-sex couples living in Nebraska.2
- By 2005, the number of same-sex couples increased to 3,986.3 This increase likely reflects same-sex couples’ growing willingness to disclose their partnerships on government surveys.
- In 2005, there were an estimated 42,934 gay, lesbian, and bisexual people (single and coupled) living in Nebraska.4

INDIVIDUALS IN SAME-SEX COUPLES ARE DEMOGRAPHICALLY AND GEOGRAPHICALLY DIVERSE

- There are more female same-sex couples (52%) than male same-sex couples (48%) in Nebraska.5
- Individuals in same-sex couples are, on average, 40 years old, and significantly younger than individuals in married couples (48 years old) in Nebraska.

INDIVIDUALS IN SAME-SEX COUPLES ARE ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN THE STATE ECONOMY

- Individuals in same-sex couples in Nebraska are significantly more likely to be employed than are married individuals: 85% of individuals in same-sex couples are employed, compared to 72% of married individuals.
Contrary to a popular stereotype, the annual earnings of men in same-sex couples are lower than those of married men. On average, men in same-sex couples in Nebraska earn $38,927 each year, less than $41,831 for married men. The median income of men in same-sex couples in Nebraska is $30,400, or 8% less than that of married men ($33,000).

Women in same-sex couples in Nebraska earn an average of $33,178 per year (with a median of $25,000), more than married women, whose earnings average $22,230 (with a median of $19,000). Women in same-sex couples earn less than married men as well as men in same-sex couples.

Individuals in same-sex couples in Nebraska are more likely to work in the private sector: 76% of individuals in same-sex couples work in the private sector, compared to 68% of married individuals; 16% of individuals in same-sex couples work in the public sector, compared to 15% of married individuals; and 8% of individuals in same-sex couples are self-employed, compared to 16% of married individuals.

Individuals in same-sex couples are significantly more likely to have a college degree: 40% of individuals in same-sex couples and 26% of married individuals have earned a college degree.

Despite the military’s historic policies of excluding gay men and lesbians from service, individuals in same-sex couples have served in the military: 13% of individuals in same-sex couples are veterans, compared to 17% of married individuals.

Same-sex partners in Nebraska depend upon one another in ways that are similar to married couples.

Couples in which one partner does not work or earns significantly less than the other partner may indicate financial interdependence. 20% of same-sex couples have only one wage earner, compared to 25% of married couples.

The income gap between same-sex partners is $23,432, compared to $24,324 for married spouses.

A larger percentage of same-sex couples in Nebraska have at least one partner who is disabled: 29% of same-sex couples, compared to 24% of married couples.

4% of same-sex couples have at least one partner who is age 65 or older, compared to 19% of married couples.

**SAME-SEX HOUSEHOLDS IN NEBRASKA HAVE SIMILAR ECONOMIC RESOURCES TO MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS**

The median income of same-sex coupled households in Nebraska is $66,910, compared to $52,870 for married couples. The average household income of same-sex couples is $72,285, compared to $64,383 for married couples.

Same-sex couples are significantly less likely than married couples to own their homes: 68% of same-sex couples in Nebraska own their home, compared to 83% of married couples.

**SAME-SEX COUPLES ARE RAISING CHILDREN IN NEBRASKA, YET WITH FEWER ECONOMIC RESOURCES THAN MARRIED PARENTS**

About 30% of same-sex couples in Nebraska are raising children under the age of 18.

As of 2005, an estimated 1,885 of Nebraska’s children are living in households headed by same-sex couples.

In Nebraska, married and same-sex couples with children under 18 in the home have, on average, 2 children.

More than 3% of Nebraska’s adopted children (or 367 children) live with a lesbian or gay parent.

17% of same-sex parents have only one wage earner, compared to 24% of married parents.
• Same-sex parents have fewer financial resources to support their children than married parents in Nebraska. The median household income of same-sex couples with children is $49,300, or 12% lower than that of married parents ($55,800). The average household income of same-sex couples with children is $56,906, less than $66,451 for married parents.

• While 48% of same-sex couples with children own their home, a significantly larger percentage of married parents (79%) own their home.

CONCLUSION

Census data provide valuable information about gay and lesbian couples in Nebraska. While in many respects Nebraska’s same-sex couples look like married couples, same-sex couples with children have fewer economic resources than married parents to provide for their families and lower rates of homeownership.

Table One: Characteristics of individuals in couples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Same-Sex</th>
<th>Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.4%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>48.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a college degree or better</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>26.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Employed</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>72.0%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Two: Characteristics of couples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same-Sex</th>
<th>Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one partner 65 or older</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>19.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent disabled</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income</td>
<td>$72,285</td>
<td>$64,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$66,910</td>
<td>$52,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income gap between partners</td>
<td>$23,432</td>
<td>$24,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single wage earner</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>83.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children under 18</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>47.5%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Three: Characteristics of couples with children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same-Sex parents</th>
<th>Married parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children under 18 in the household</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single wage earner (parents)</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income (parents)</td>
<td>$56,906</td>
<td>$66,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (parents)</td>
<td>$49,300</td>
<td>$55,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>79.5%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference significant at the 5% level or better (two-tailed tests).
^ Difference significant at the 10% level or better (two-tailed tests).
## Appendix A: Counts and percent of same-sex couples by county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of same-sex couples</th>
<th>Percent of same-sex couples out of all households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Butte</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundyl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchcock</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keya Paha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loup</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrick</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuckolls</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otoe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawnee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Willow</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpy</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Bluff</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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