

Reproducibility of Survey Measurements of Sexual Orientation in the USA

Charles F. Turner¹, Brett A. Turner², and James R. Chromy³

¹ City University of New York, Queens College and the Graduate Center, Flushing, New York, United States of America

² City University of New York, Queens College, Flushing, New York, United States of America, Current address: Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

³ RTI International (Emeritus), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, United States of America

Corresponding Author: Charles F. Turner, CFTurner@PopEpi.org

SHORT TITLE: Survey Measurements of Sexual Orientation in the USA

DISCLOSURES

Declaration of Interest

No potential conflicts of interest are reported by the authors.

Data Availability and IRB Statement

The datasets used in these secondary analyses are publicly available without restriction ([https://gss.norc.org/get-the-data](https://gss.norc.umd.edu/get-the-data) and <https://nhis.ipeds.org/nhis/>). As such, these secondary analyses are exempt from IRB review.

Funding Details

This work was supported in part by a sabbatical leave fellowship to CFT by the City University of New York (Queens College). The authors designed the study, conducted the analysis, and are solely responsible for interpretation of the data, the writing of the manuscript, and the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. The funder had no role in these activities.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Reproducibility of Survey Measurements of Sexual Orientation in the USA

Abstract

Survey measurements of sexual orientation have become increasingly common in national population surveys although validation of these measurements is rare and inherently problematic. We instead assess the *reproducibility* of parallel measurements from two independent samples of the USA population made in the 2008-2018 General Social Surveys and the adult probability subsets of the 2013-2018 National Health Interview Survey (Ns = 12,098 and 190,113).

Restricting analysis to the categories gay/lesbian, bisexual, and straight, we obtain similar estimates of the proportion of the U.S. population who consider themselves gay/lesbian (NHIS: 1.59% vs. GSS: 1.93%, $p = 0.059$) but not bisexual (NHIS: 1.03% vs. GSS: 2.90%, $p < 0.001$). Fitting multinomial logistic regression models controlling for year, gender, birth cohort, education, and race, we find that compared to the NHIS, the GSS had 1.248 ($p=0.022$) times higher relative odds of eliciting a response of Gay-Lesbian (vs. Straight) and 2.980 ($p<0.001$) times higher relative odds of eliciting a response of Bisexual (vs. Straight). Expanding the model by adding 3-way interaction terms for orientation-by-predictor-by-survey, we find that we cannot reject the null hypothesis that *trends* over time and across subpopulations in reporting of sexual orientation were statistically equivalent for the two survey programs.

Keywords: survey design; bisexuality; sexual orientation; sexual identity; sexual minorities

23 1. Introduction

24 Since the 1990s, survey measurements of sexual orientation have become increasingly common
25 in population surveys of sexual behavior in the USA, Europe, and elsewhere [1-4]. Assessments of the
26 accuracy of such measurements are infrequent, however, and can be problematic.

27 There is a large literature documenting the ways in which seemingly trivial variations in survey
28 protocols can induce substantial discrepancies in the measurements obtained. These include seemingly
29 minor variations in question wording, context, mode of administration, etc. [5-7]. This problem has been
30 long known to affect so-called “objective” measurements (e.g., personal bankruptcy [8]) in which the
31 notion of a measurement’s “true value” can be logically sustained. In those instances it is theoretically
32 possible to attempt validation by comparing survey reports to a presumed veridical record (e.g.,
33 comparing survey reports of personal bankruptcy to court records). This is not to say, of course, that such
34 comparisons can be easily (or ever) accomplished for every objective phenomenon; consider for example
35 the difficulty of validating reported condom use at last sex. While partner reports might seem to provide
36 a reasonable strategy, there are inherent limitations to this approach, e.g., in the case of anonymous hook-
37 ups.

38 This problem becomes even more difficult for subjective measurements where there is simply no
39 veridical record that can be used to validate survey reports of: how happy someone is, their approval of
40 the President, or their sexual orientation [9]. A preliminary question, however, can be fruitfully attacked
41 without taking on the epistemological challenges posed by “validation”. That question is the
42 *reproducibility* of the survey measurements of the subjective phenomena that is at issue. For us it is the
43 reproducibility of survey measurements of sexual orientation.

44 In the present instance we have the benefit of two independent series of surveys that measured
45 the reported sexual orientation of the U.S. adult population. These measurements come from the 2008 to
46 2018 waves of the biennial General Social Survey [10] and the 2013 to 2018 waves of the annual
47 National Health Interview Survey [11,12]. These data sources have two important advantages for
48 assessing the reproducibility of survey measurements of sexual orientation. First, they are well-regarded
49 surveys of large probability samples of the U.S. population (Ns across available years =12,098 GSS, and

50 190,113 for the probability adult segment of the NHIS samples; it should be noted that while the GSS
51 conducted a total of 13,794 interviews in 2008 through 2018, only 12,098 respondents were included in
52 survey segments that included the Sexual Orientation question.) Second, these survey programs were
53 conducted by well-trained staffs of survey interviewers and other survey professionals.

54 *The NHIS program* is the USA's premier health interview survey. Begun in 1957, the NHIS is
55 designed "to secure accurate and current statistical information on the amount, distribution, and effects of
56 illness and disability in the United States and the services rendered for or because of such conditions"
57 (https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/about_nhis.htm, accessed January 13, 2020). This survey program
58 annually draws large representative samples of the USA population and uses U.S. Census Bureau
59 interviewers to conduct interviews. For example, in the 2018 survey, 29,839 households were included in
60 the NHIS sample [11, p. 20]. One probabilistically selected adult from each sampled household was
61 selected for inclusion in the adult probability component of the NHIS. In 2018 that yielded 25,417
62 completed interviews. This component of the 1997 through 2018 NHIS is the focus of all of our NHIS
63 analyses (unweighted annual Ns range from 21,781 to 36,697).

64 *The GSS Program* is a major representative sample survey of adults residing in households in the
65 USA. It has been conducted since 1972 as part of the National Science Foundation's National Data
66 Program for the Social Sciences [10]. The GSS is conducted using in-person interviews conducted by
67 professional interviewers employed and supervised by the National Opinion Research Center at the
68 University of Chicago. GSS surveys were conducted annually between 1972 and 1994 and biennially in
69 subsequent years. These surveys have included "a standard core of demographic, behavioral, and
70 attitudinal questions, plus topics of special interest. Among the topics covered are civil liberties, crime
71 and violence, intergroup tolerance, morality, national spending priorities, psychological well-being,
72 social mobility, and stress and traumatic events" [13].

73 Beginning in 1988, the GSS has included questions on sexual behaviors; in 2008 a question on
74 sexual orientation was added. The GSS sexual orientation data from 2008 through 2018 provide the basis
75 for our comparative analyses. The 2008-2018 GSS drew probability samples of US households and
76 interviewed one probabilistically selected adult from each household. Biennial GSS samples included

77 between 1,974 and 2,867 adults in 2008 through 2018. (In the 2016 and 2018 GSS the sexual orientation
78 question was only asked of a randomly selected two-thirds of the survey sample.)

79

80 **2. Materials and Methods**

81 *2.1 Questioning*

82 While the sexual orientation question was quite similar in the two survey programs, there was a
83 minor difference in the question stem and a more substantial difference in the response categories that
84 were offered (see Table 1). There were also substantial differences in the introductory texts and questions
85 preceding the sexual orientation measurement and in the methods of question administration.

86

87

89 **Table 1. Questions Measuring Sexual Orientation in the 2008-2018 General Social Surveys**
 90 **and National Health Interview Surveys.**

91

Component	General Social Survey (a,b)	National Health Interview Survey
Introductory Text	"There is a great deal of concern today about the AIDS epidemic and how to deal with it. Because of the grave nature of this problem, we are going to ask you some personal questions and we need your frank and honest responses. Your answers are confidential."	"You are about to enter the Sexual Identity and Lifestyle questions section. This section includes questions on computer use, the respondent's neighborhood, sexual identity, financial worries, mental health, and HIV testing."
Question Wording	Which of the following best describes you?	Which of the following best represents how you think of yourself?
Response Categories	Gay, Lesbian or Homosexual Bisexual Heterosexual or straight (Computer provided dedicated keys to indicate "don't know" and "refused".)	1. Gay (<i>if male</i>); Lesbian or Gay (<i>if female</i>); 2. Straight, that is, not gay (<i>if male</i>); Straight, that is not lesbian or gay (<i>if female</i>) 3. Bisexual 4. Something else 5. I don't know the answer
Mode of Administration	Computer-Assisted Self Interview (Video-CASI) (b)	Interviewed-administered using CAPI <i>with Flashcards in Male or Female versions.</i>

(a) Source: [13].

(b) GSS dataset in 2008 (but not other years) includes variable SCIMODE which is described as "Is the SAQ self administered or interviewer administered". Responses in 2008 were: Assigned and done as interviewed = 1,237; Assigned and done as SAQ = 140; Assigned as SAQ done in interview due to R's request/inability to do as SAQ = 89; Assigned as SAQ done in interview on phone = 39; Inapplicable = 518.

92

94
95 Using video-CASI, the GSS administered the sexual orientation question and a range of
96 questions on sexual behaviors including a variety of questions on number, gender, and types
97 (friend, spouse, date, sex worker, etc.) of sexual partners in lifetime and during recent years (1, 5,
98 etc.), frequency of sex, condom use, injection drug use, cocaine use, etc. [14]. In the video-CASI
99 procedure, interviewers do not ask the survey questions, but rather the questions are shown on
100 the screen of a laptop computer and respondents reply using the laptop computer’s mouse or
101 keyboard. Thus the interviewers are unaware of the questions being asked and the responses the
102 interviewee gives. Dedicated keys on the laptop’s keyboard (as well as categories shown on the
103 laptop screen) allow respondents to answer “Don’t Know” or to refuse to respond to the
104 question)

105 A number of randomized survey experiments ([15-17] report substantial differences in
106 the reporting of sensitive behaviors when CASI survey technologies are used in place of human
107 interviewing. However, a carefully conducted, randomized experiment by NCHS [18] did not
108 find substantial differences in responses to the NHIS sexual orientation question using audio-
109 CASI versus the NHIS “showcard” protocol described here.

110
111 *2.2 Response Categories.*

112 The GSS sexual orientation question asks which of the offered response options “best describes
113 you” while the NHIS sexual orientation question similarly asks which option “best represents
114 how you think of yourself”. The response categories, however, diverged more substantially. The
115 GSS offered the response categories: Gay, Lesbian or Homosexual; Bisexual; and Heterosexual
116 or straight. The NHIS, however, also offered the explicit response categories: “4. Something
117 else” and “5. I do not know the answer” while the GSS does not explicitly offer similar options.

118 36 of the 12,098 respondents in the 2008-2018 GSS were coded as responding “Don’t
119 Know” (weighted 0.31%, se = 0.05%) on the sexual orientation question. In contrast, 1,259 of

120 190,113 of NHIS respondents chose the *offered* option of “5 --I do not know the answer”
121 (weighted 0.67%, se = 0.03%). A further difference is found for the “something else” response
122 category. The GSS did not offer this option forcing respondents to choose among the three
123 substantive response categories or to provide no response. In the NHIS, 636 of 190,113
124 respondents chose the offered answer category: “4 --. Something else” (weighted 0.32%, se =
125 0.02%).

126

127 *2.3 Differences in the Population Surveyed.*

128 While both survey programs provide broadly representative samples of the adult
129 population of the USA, one minor divergence should be noted. The GSS sample is limited to the
130 *household* population while the NHIS sample covers the entire civilian non-institutionalized
131 population. So, for example, the NHIS includes a dormitory component in its sampling frame
132 while the GSS does not. As a crude check of the impact of this variation, we compared NHIS
133 estimates of sexual orientation with and without the non-household segment of the NHIS sample.
134 Since only 0.95% of the NHIS adult probability sample (unweighted N = 1,739 of 183,020) were
135 non-household residents, it is not surprising to find (see Appendix Table B) that the estimates are
136 virtually identical.

137 Since language barriers are a potential reason for non-response in both survey programs,
138 it is important to note that both survey programs conducted interviewing in both English and
139 Spanish in 2008 - 2018.

140

141 *2.4 Combining Samples.*

142 For our reproducibility analysis, we analyze a combined data set containing data from 6
143 biannual GSS surveys (2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018) and from 6 annual NHIS
144 surveys (2013 to 2018).

145 The combination of these files is not as straightforward as merely concatenating the two
146 data files and ensuring that variable names and response categories are made equivalent. While
147 that would be sufficient for two simple random samples of the population, it unfortunately is not
148 adequate for these two complex probability samples. In particular, we must ensure consistency
149 in the handling of weights and the variables required for calculation of the effects of the complex
150 sample designs used in each of these survey programs. (Weights include adjustments for
151 sampling factors and in the NCHS post-stratification adjustments for the impact of survey
152 nonresponse. The GSS did not employ such post-stratification adjustments for non-response
153 [19].)

154
155 For the analyses reported in this article, a composite GSS-NHIS data file was created.
156 First *new weights* were constructed for each wave of the NHIS (2013, 2014 ... 2018) and GSS
157 survey (2008, 2010... 2018). These new weights for survey respondents were computed as the
158 originally assigned weight divided by the mean of all weights for that wave of the survey. As a
159 check on the accuracy of this step, we inspected all permutations of Survey-by-Wave to ensure
160 that the sum of the new case weights equaled the unweighted sample sizes for each of these
161 permutations — as well as for the total survey samples. Strata and PSU numbering were
162 unaltered from the original survey datasets.

163

164 *2.6. Statistical Analyses.*

165 We begin our analyses by reporting the number and percentages of GSS and NHIS
166 respondents who were recorded as choosing each substantive response plus those providing non-
167 substantive responses, e.g., refusals to answer. We then attempt direct comparisons of response
168 distributions obtained in the two survey programs using alternative methods for handling
169 discrepant responses in the two survey programs, e.g., the lack of an explicit “Don’t Know”
170 response category in the GSS.

171 Subsequently, we test the congruence of the results of the two survey programs in
172 monitoring trends in reported sexual orientation over time and birth cohorts and across
173 sociodemographic subsets of the population. All analyses were performed using Stata version 15
174 [20] and employ Stata’s `svy` procedures to take account of the complex sample designs of these
175 surveys in estimating results for the U.S. adult population.

176

177 **3. Results**

178 ***3.1 Full Response Distributions.***

179 The first panel of Table 2 shows results for the full set of response categories for both the
180 GSS and NHIS measurements across all years in which the questions were asked, i.e., annually in
181 2013-2018 in the NHIS and biennially in 2008-2018 in the GSS. For this initial analysis, we will
182 not synchronize the time periods used in the two surveys.

184 **Table 2. Estimated Prevalence of sexual orientations reported by adult population in 2013-18 NHIS and 2008-**
 185 **18 GSS [d].**
 186

SURVEY		Gay/ Lesbian	Straight	Bisexual	Something Else [a]	Don't Know	Unknown / Not Ascertained [b,c]	Refused	Unweighted Ns
NHIS	<i>est.</i>	1.58%	93.79%	0.93%	0.32%	0.67%	2.19%	0.51%	190,113
	<i>se</i>	0.04%	0.09%	0.03%	0.02%	0.03%	0.53%	0.02%	
GSS	<i>est.</i>	1.50%	85.32%	2.00%	na	0.31%	9.510%	1.37%	12,098
	<i>se</i>	0.11%	0.48%	0.14%	na	0.05%	0.430%	0.13%	
<i>Estimates excluding "Not Ascertained" Responses</i>									
NHIS	<i>est.</i>	1.62%	95.90%	0.95%	0.33%	0.69%	na	0.53%	186,048
	<i>se</i>	0.04%	0.07%	0.03%	0.02%	0.03%	na	0.02%	
GSS	<i>est.</i>	1.66%	94.28%	2.21%	na	0.34%	na	1.51%	10,894
	<i>se</i>	0.12%	0.26%	0.16%	na	0.06%	na	0.15%	

(a) The "something else" category was only offered explicitly in the NHIS surveys.

[b] The NHIS surveyors report that "For partially completed interviews (e.g., Sample Adult interviews where the respondent discontinued the interviews any time after completing the first three sections), the responses will appear as 8's (not ascertained) for the remaining variables in the file ... A code of 8 is also used to indicate "not ascertained" responses when the field was blank or contained an impossible code. [11, p. 19]" The authors also note that "In the 2018 data file, for example, 3.0% of completed sample adult cases were partially completed interviews that were deemed sufficient for analysis (that is, the sample adult discontinued the interview but did complete at least the first three sections) [11, p. 81)".

[c] The 2018 GSS Codebook notes that "People who did not do this [sex] supplement are coded as IAP." In 2008-2014 the sexual orientation question was asked in all three of randomly-assigned "ballots" of the GSS, and 863 of 8,579 respondents (10.1% unweighted) were coded as IAP in those years. It should be noted that in 2016 and 2018, the sexual orientation question was asked in only two of the three GSS "ballots," and thus all respondents in the excluded ballot were coded as IAP. (These respondents are not included in the tabulation above.)

[d] Estimates shown in Table 2 were calculated from the public use datasets released by the IPUMS Health Surveys website[12] and the NORC General Social Survey website [10].

189 Not surprisingly, we find that there is notable disagreement in the results obtained by
190 these two measurement programs. A primary source of this disagreement arises from the much
191 higher population percentage that was not asked the sexual orientation question because either:

192

193 In the NHIS, they discontinued the survey before reaching the sexual orientation question
194 (2.19%), or

195

196 In the GSS, they discontinued the survey before reaching the self-administered sexual
197 behaviors section of the GSS survey or did not complete this section due to refusal or
198 some other reason and thus were coded as not ascertained (IAP, 9.51%). (The GSS
199 Director has noted that “[the GSS dataset] does not have a variable that delineates refusal
200 to do the SAQ [self-administered questionnaire], although that is what most of the ... IAP
201 probably are (Tom Smith, personal communication, March 4, 2020)”.

202

203 The relatively large percentage of GSS respondents refusing the sexual behavior section of the
204 survey may reflect the wide range of sensitive information that was requested by this GSS
205 section, e.g., number, gender, and types of sexual partners, frequency of sex, etc. This variation
206 in measurement mechanics perturbs all other results. This is troublesome given our focus on a
207 relatively rare characteristic of the population, i.e., the prevalence of non-heterosexual
208 orientations.

209 As a rough correction for this measurement variation, the lower panel of Table 2 shows
210 estimated prevalence based only on respondents who were asked the sexual orientation question.
211 Both survey programs estimate that 94% to 96% of the U.S. population describes themselves as

212 heterosexual or straight while approximately 1.6% to 1.7% of the population describes itself as
213 gay or lesbian. An additional 0.5% to 1.5% of the population is classified as refusing to respond
214 to the sexual orientation question. There is, however, less agreement on estimates of the
215 population classifying themselves as bisexual. Although the percentages are low, the GSS
216 estimates more than double the prevalence of self-reported bisexuality in the U.S. population
217 compared to the NHIS survey program (GSS: 2.21%, se = 0.16%; NHIS: 0.95%, se = 0.03%;
218 $p < 0.001$)

219 Some discrepancies in these estimates might be expected given the variation in the
220 protocols used by the two survey programs. We note, for example, that the NHIS program
221 included an explicit category (“something else”) for respondents who did not feel comfortable
222 using the three sexual orientations: straight, gay-lesbian, or bisexual. In addition, the mode of
223 survey administration varied between the two survey programs.

224 In addition, we note differences in question wording and administration. NHIS
225 interviewers asked the question, “Which of the following best represents how you think of
226 yourself?” with respondents choosing their response category from a flashcard. In contrast, the
227 GSS program used video-CASI to administer the sexual orientation and other sensitive questions.
228 (A small number of GSS sexual orientation measurements were made by telephone. In 2008, 39
229 of these GSS measurements were made in interviewer-administered telephone interviews.) In the
230 video-CASI mode of administration, the survey interviewer does not ask the question nor hear
231 the respondent’s choice of a response. This variation in survey mode may have affected the
232 measurements by, among other things, affecting respondents’ willingness to provide an accurate
233 report of their sexual orientation.

234 It is also possible that variations in survey administration may have affected the salience
235 of non-substantive response options. In the GSS video-CASI administration, respondents were
236 told to press one of two keys on their laptop if they either did not know the answer to the

237 question or did not wish to provide an answer. In contrast, NHIS respondents were offered an
238 explicit option on the flashcard of “I do not know the answer” but no explicit refusal option.
239 These and other variations in survey protocol might account for the incomplete equivalence in
240 the point estimates obtained by the two survey programs shown in Table 2.

241 A common analytic response to non-equivalence in the response categories offered by
242 two measurement programs is to focus analysis on the common substantive responses. In the
243 present case an analyst might keep the three substantive response categories (straight, gay-
244 lesbian, and bisexual) and drop all cases in which respondents gave a non-substantive response,
245 i.e., don’t know, “something else”, or refused to respond. As shown in Table 2 (lower panel),
246 estimates for these non-substantive response categories total 1.55% for the NHIS and 1.85% for
247 the GSS. While these are fairly trivial percentages, it should be borne in mind that the estimated
248 size of the (self-described) gay/lesbian and bisexual subpopulations are only 3 to 4%.

249

250 *3.2 Simple Analyses Restricted to Three Substantive Response Categories.*

251 As shown in Table 3, restricting analysis to the three substantive categories of
252 gay/lesbian, straight, and bisexual, produces quite similar estimates of the proportion of the U.S.
253 population who consider themselves gay or lesbian. The NHIS yields an estimate of 1.59%
254 (se=0.06%) which is only modestly different from the estimate produced by the GSS (1.93%,
255 se=0.17%), and that difference is of borderline statistical significance ($p = 0.059$).

256 Approximately similar results are found when males and females are considered separately. For
257 males, the NHIS estimates that 1.81% (se=0.09%) identify themselves as gay while the GSS
258 estimates this percentage as 2.13% (se=0.28%; $p = 0.277$). For females, similar results are
259 obtained with the NHIS estimating that 1.39% (se=0.08%) of females identify as lesbian and the
260 GSS estimating this percentage as 1.77% (se=0.22%, $p=0.105$).

262 **Table 3. Estimated prevalence of self-described sexual orientations of U.S. adults in 2014, 2016, and 2018**
 263 **NHIS and GSS --- restricting response to three substantive categories of sexual orientation [a].**
 264

SURVEY & Gender		Gay/Lesbian	Straight	Bisexual	Unweighted Ns	<i>P inter-survey comparison</i>
<i>Males & Females</i>						
NHIS	<i>est.</i>	1.59%	97.38%	1.03%	91,760	<0.001
	<i>se</i>	0.06%	0.08%	0.05%		
GSS	<i>est.</i>	1.93%	95.17%	2.90%	5,421	
	<i>se</i>	0.17%	0.33%	0.26%		
Total	<i>est.</i>	1.62%	97.22%	1.16%	97,181	
	<i>se</i>	0.06%	0.07%	0.05%		
<i>Males only</i>						
NHIS	<i>est.</i>	1.810%	97.570%	0.620%	41,465	<0.001
	<i>se</i>	0.09%	0.11%	0.06%		
GSS	<i>est.</i>	2.13%	96.35%	1.52%	2,464	
	<i>se</i>	0.28%	0.39%	0.24%		
All Males	<i>est.</i>	1.83%	97.49%	0.68%	43,929	
	<i>se</i>	0.09%	0.10%	0.05%		
<i>Females only</i>						
NHIS	<i>est.</i>	1.39%	97.19%	1.42%	50,295	<0.001
	<i>se</i>	0.08%	0.11%	0.08%		
GSS	<i>est.</i>	1.77%	94.16%	4.07%	2,957	
	<i>se</i>	0.22%	0.50%	0.42%		
All Females	<i>est.</i>	1.42%	96.97%	1.61%	53,252	
	<i>se</i>	0.07%	0.11%	0.08%		

[a] Tabulations in Tables 3 and 4 are derived from composite NHIS-GSS dataset described in the text. All estimates employ weights and take account of the complex designs used by the two survey programs. Note that unlike Table 2, this tabulation includes only the three years in which both surveys made measurements of sexual orientation.

268

269 However, similar equivalence is not found for estimates of the percentage of the U.S.
270 population identifying as bisexual ($p < 0.001$). Overall, the NHIS survey program estimates that
271 1.03% ($se=0.05\%$) of the U.S. population identifies as bisexual while the GSS survey program
272 yields an estimate that is more than twice as high (2.90%, $se=0.26\%$). Roughly similar
273 discrepancies are found when men and women are considered separately with the GSS bisexual
274 estimates being two to three times higher than the NHIS estimates; see Table 3).

275 It should be noted that this non-equivalence is not eliminated by focusing on the contrast
276 between respondents reporting a “straight” sexual orientation versus those reporting a “non-
277 straight” orientation, i.e., gay/lesbian or bisexual. Overall – as might be inferred from Table 3 –
278 the GSS estimates that a higher percentage of the U.S. population identifies with a “non-straight”
279 orientation than does the NHIS (4.83% vs. 2.62%, $p < 0.001$).

280

281 *3.3 Testing Reproducibility with Controls for Sociodemographic Factors*

282 We refined and expanded the foregoing analyses by fitting multinomial logistic regression
283 models that predict our 3-category outcome variable (gay, straight, bisexual) as a function of the
284 survey making the measurements plus five control variables. These control variables were: the
285 year the survey was conducted, and the respondent’s gender, birth cohort (in decades), education,
286 and race. The latter four predictors have been shown in previous research to be associated with
287 reporting of alternative sexual orientations and/or behaviors (e.g., Turner et al., 2005; England et
288 al., 2016). For these analyses we restricted our sample to the three years (2014, 2016, 2018) in
289 which both the NHIS and GSS surveys collected respondents’ reports of their sexual orientation.

290 Table 4 presents the results of this analyses. In this analysis the response “straight” is the
291 base outcome. The entries in this table show the estimated relative odds of the responses: (1) gay
292 vs. straight, and (2) bisexual vs. straight, adjusted for the other predictor variables in the model.

293 Our results indicate that compared to the NHIS, the GSS has 1.248 ($p=0.022$) times higher
294 relative odds of eliciting a response of Gay-Lesbian (vs. Straight) and 2.980 ($p<0.001$) times
295 higher relative odds of eliciting a response of Bisexual (vs. Straight). Overall, this result indicates
296 that the discrepancies observed in our simpler analyses (Table 3) are not eliminated by the
297 inclusion of the five control variables nor the restriction of our analysis to the three years in
298 which both surveys made measurements.
299

301 **Table 4. Multinomial logistic regression results: (1) predicting relative log odds and (2) relative odds for**
 302 **reporting a gay or bisexual (vs. straight) orientation as a function of the survey making the measurement**
 303 **controlling for birth cohort and selected sociodemographic variables.**
 304

PREDICTOR	RESPONSE Gay - Lesbian			RESPONSE Bisexual			P Main Effect (b)
	Coef. Relative Log Odds (a)	Relative Odds Ratio (a)	P	Coef. Relative Log Odds (a)	Relative Odds Ratio (a)	P	
SURVEY							
NHIS	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		
GSS	0.222	1.248	0.022	1.092	2.980	<0.001	<0.001
GENDER							
Male	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		
Female	-0.244	0.783	0.001	0.915	2.497	<0.001	<0.001
BIRTH COHORT							
1930 & earlier	<i>ref.</i>			<i>ref.</i>			
1940	0.495	1.641	0.020	0.160	1.173	0.630	
1950	0.931	2.537	< 0.001	0.397	1.488	0.176	
1960	1.310	3.708	< 0.001	0.804	2.235	0.005	
1970	1.189	3.282	< 0.001	1.171	3.226	< 0.001	
1980	1.293	3.643	< 0.001	1.941	6.964	< 0.001	
1990+ (c)	1.455	4.285	< 0.001	2.492	12.080	< 0.001	<0.001
EDUCATION							
<HS	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		
HS Graduate	0.575	1.777	0.001	-0.263	0.769	0.104	
BA/BS	0.890	2.434	<0.001	-0.125	0.882	0.473	
Post-BA	1.217	3.378	<0.001	-0.108	0.898	0.575	<0.001
RACE							
White	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		
Black	0.101	1.107	0.301	-0.263	0.769	0.017	
Other	-0.326	0.722	0.018	-0.297	0.743	0.063	0.009
YEAR OF SURVEY							
2014	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		
2016	-0.057	0.944	0.500	0.210	1.234	0.033	
2018	-0.037	0.964	0.673	0.358	1.430	<0.001	0.009
CONS.	-5.783		<0.001	-6.544		<0.001	

305
 306
 307 (a) Estimates derived by multinomial logistic regression accounting for complex design of samples (F[32,
 308 851] = 23.48, p < 0.001). Coefficients indicate the estimated relative log odds of reporting Gay-Lesbian (or
 309 Bisexual) associated with being in the row category (e.g., female) of the predictor variable compared to the
 310 base category (e.g., male) when controlling for other factors in the model. The exponentiated value of this
 311 coefficient is the corresponding relative odds ratio. For rare attributes, this value is close to the relative
 312 risk ratio.
 313 (b) Test of the null hypotheses that coefficients for categories of sexual orientation by predictor are zero.
 314 (c) The 1990+ cohort includes 22 GSS respondents and 210 NHIS respondents born in 2000.

316

317 In passing we note that this analysis replicates many aspects of previous findings. Thus
318 we note monotonic increases across birth cohorts in the relative odds that respondents will
319 choose the categories gay-lesbian and bisexual versus straight. These results are quite startling
320 although they are consistent with past research [21-22]. Thus compared to the 1930s, birth
321 cohort, members of the 1990s cohort have 4.3 ($p < 0.001$) times higher relative odds of reporting a
322 gay-lesbian orientation and 12.1 ($p < 0.001$) times higher odds of reporting a bisexual orientation.
323 We similarly find that compared to men, women have 0.78 ($p < 0.001$) times lower relative odds
324 of reporting a gay-lesbian orientation but a 2.50 times ($p = 0.001$) higher relative odds of
325 reporting a bisexual orientation.

326 Controlling for other factors in the model, higher levels of education were associated with
327 increased relative odds of reporting a gay-lesbian (vs. straight) orientation but a similar result is
328 not found for reporting of a bisexual orientation. Thus persons with a college degree and post-
329 college education had 2.43 and 3.38 ($ps < 0.001$) times higher relative odds of reporting a gay-
330 lesbian (vs. straight) orientation. A parallel result is not found for reporting a bisexual
331 orientation. Surprisingly, this analysis reveals that reported sexual orientations varied
332 significantly across the three years in which the surveys were conducted when other variables are
333 controlled. Most noticeably, relative to respondents in 2014, respondents in 2016 had 1.23
334 ($p = 0.033$) higher relative odds of reporting a bisexual (vs. straight) orientation and respondents
335 in 2018 had 1.43 ($p < 0.001$) times higher relative odds of reporting a bisexual (vs. straight)
336 orientation. This analysis also reveals a significant association of race with reported sexual
337 orientation. Respondents of “other” races (i.e., not black or white) had 0.72 lower relative odds
338 than whites ($p = 0.018$) of reporting a gay-lesbian orientation (vs. straight) and borderline lower
339 relative odds (0.74, $p = 0.063$) of reporting a bisexual (vs. straight) orientation. Black respondents
340 also had 0.77 ($p = 0.017$) times lower relative odds than whites of reporting a bisexual orientation

341 although the difference in relative odds of reporting gay/lesbian orientations was not statistically
342 significantly (1.11, $p = 0.301$).

343

344 *3.4 Reproducibility of Predictor-by-Orientation Associations.*

345 While the observed disagreements in point estimates of the sexual orientations reported
346 by the U.S. population are noteworthy and sociodemographic controls do not eliminate that
347 disagreement, it can be argued that this does not detract from one of the most important uses of
348 such data — monitoring *trends over time and variations across subpopulations* in sexual
349 orientations. Indeed, since the measurement protocols used by the two surveys are not fully
350 equivalent, some non-equivalence in these estimates of sexual orientation should be expected.
351 The measurements may nonetheless provide equivalently reliable and important indicators of
352 trends in sexual orientations in the population over *time and across subpopulations*.

353 To test this possibility, we expanded the foregoing multinomial logistic model (Table 4).
354 This expanded model added 3-way interaction terms for orientation-by-predictor-by-survey to
355 allow that the two surveys might produce different point estimates of sexual orientation while
356 testing the hypothesis that *trends* over time and across subpopulations in reporting of sexual
357 orientation were statistically equivalent for the two survey programs. This model (Appendix
358 Table A) includes the same five predictor variables shown in Table 4 but adds estimates of 3-way
359 interactions of Survey-by-Predictor-by-Orientation. Estimates of these terms provide tests of the
360 hypotheses that the patterns of Orientation-by-Predictor association found by the two survey
361 programs are statistically equivalent. For example, the *sexual orientation by year by survey*
362 interaction term tests the hypothesis that the two survey programs yield statistically equivalent
363 estimates of *trends* in reported sexual orientation over the years 2014, 2016, and 2018. Similarly,
364 the *sexual orientation by birth cohort by survey* interaction term tests the hypothesis that the two
365 surveys produce statistically equivalent estimates of variation in reported sexual orientations

366 *across birth cohorts*. The remaining 3-way orientation-by-predictor-by-survey terms provide
367 similar tests of statistical significance of the remaining interactions.

368 The full set of results for this analysis are shown in Appendix Table A, (Since these tests
369 used our expanded model with five additional interaction terms [see Appendix Table A], the
370 estimated relative odds for the main effects are not identical to those reported in Table 4.) It will
371 be seen that none of the 3-way interaction terms were statistically significant. These null results
372 provide an important part of the answer to our basic question about the reproducibility of sexual
373 orientation findings from the two survey programs. We have previously seen that there are
374 statistically significant variations in the two surveys' point estimates of sexual orientation and
375 that these differences remain even when a variety of sociodemographic controls are applied.
376 Nonetheless, the measurements from these two survey programs do not yield significantly
377 different conclusions about trends in the population's reported sexual orientations over time or
378 birth cohort nor in the patterns of association between the population's reported sexual
379 orientations and the other sociodemographic variables included in our model.

380

381 **4. Discussion**

382 Our analysis benefits both from the large, well-executed probability samples used by the
383 GSS and NHIS survey programs and from the well-trained and experienced interview and survey
384 staffs used by these survey programs. While the univariate distributions of social characteristics
385 of the U.S. population are often of minor interest, that has not been the case for estimates of the
386 sexual orientation. Controversies about the size of the U.S. population with non-heterosexual
387 preferences date back, at least, to the 1948 publication of Kinsey et al.'s *Sexual Behavior in the*
388 *Human Male* [23]. That volume famously estimated that "10 per cent of the males are more or
389 less exclusively homosexual ... for at least three years between the ages of 16 and 55. (*p. 651,*
390 *emphasis in original*)" That figure was both politically controversial and scientifically suspect

391 given the non-probability nature of Kinsey et al.’s sample and other deficiencies in this
392 pioneering work [24].

393 Subsequent to Kinsey et al.’s companion publication on women [25], relatively little new
394 empirical quantitative research was published on sexual behaviors in the U.S. population. The
395 onset of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the 1980s began to remedy this deficiency by the end of the
396 1980s. Reports from the Institute of Medicine and the National Academy of Sciences [26-28]
397 helped bring pressure on the National Institutes of Health to fund the needed research on the
398 sexual behavior of the U.S. population although political opposition slowed these efforts both in
399 the USA [29] and the UK [2].

400 The subsequent surfeit of survey data in the 1990s and beyond provided much missing
401 information on the variety of sexual behaviors in the U.S. and other populations. The present
402 article advances this effort by providing an evaluation of the reproducibility of an important
403 series of such measurements made by two major survey programs in the USA.

404

405 *4.1 Congruence of Measurements*

406 The data we analyze do not arise from a planned experiment but rather from the fortuitous
407 coincidence of two survey programs measuring the same population characteristic in the first two
408 decades of the 21st century. As we noted previously, the measurement methods used by the two
409 survey programs were not identical in a variety of ways. For example,

- 410 • The interview mode varied: video-CASI in the GSS vs. interviewer administration using
411 flashcards in the NHIS;
- 412 • The response categories were more extensive in the NHIS including “Something Else”,
413 and an explicit “I don’t know the answer” category;
- 414 • The GSS administered a battery of questions on a variety of sexual behaviors, and some
415 respondents opted out of this entire battery of sexual questions. In contrast, missing
416

417 responses to the NHIS sexual orientation arose only from non-response to this specific
418 question.

419
420 Not surprisingly, the point estimates from the two survey programs are not statistically equivalent
421 (Table 2). “Not ascertained,” for example, was a much more common response for the GSS
422 battery of questions (9.5% population estimate) than for the NHIS question (2.2% population
423 estimate). When these responses are purged from the analysis, there still remain some substantial
424 differences. Most notably, the estimated percentage of the population classified as bisexual is
425 more than twice as high in the GSS as in the NHIS (2.21%, se = 0.16% vs. 0.95%, se=0.03%; see
426 Table 2, lower panel). In addition, even when persons refusing the sexual behavior module are
427 excluded from the GSS, the estimated percentage of the population refusing to provide their
428 sexual orientation was almost three times higher in the GSS (1.51%, se = 0.15%) versus the
429 NHIS (0.53%, se=0.02%).

430 It can be argued that the most important target variables for our analysis is the estimated
431 percentage of the U.S. population that describes itself as gay or bisexual. One common –
432 although perhaps not ideal – approach to this question is to restrict analysis to the three
433 substantive response categories: straight, gay, or bisexual. This analysis strategy (Table 3) does
434 not, however, produce statistically equivalent estimates from the two surveys ($p < 0.001$),
435 however the estimated percentage of the population classified as gay/lesbian is not significantly
436 different for either the population as a whole (NHIS: 1.59%, se= 0.06% ; and GSS:
437 1.93%,se=0.17%; $p = 0.059$) or for males and female considered separately (see Table 3). A
438 relatively large discrepancy arises, however, for the estimated proportion of the U.S. population
439 describing itself as bisexual. Overall, the GSS estimates are more than double those made from
440 the NHIS program (2.90%, se=0.26% vs. 1.03%, se=0.05%). This difference is particularly
441 pronounced for women (GSS: 4.07%, se=0.42% vs. NHIS: 1.42%, se=0.08%).

442 While the observed *discrepancies* in our survey estimates are less than two percentage
443 points, they are noteworthy because the population characteristics of interest – prevalence of gay
444 and bisexual orientations – are equally small, i.e., 1 to 4 percent. Following a suggestion by
445 England et al. [22], we refined our analysis by adding controls for a variety of factors that are
446 known to influence (reported) sexual orientation. We did find that each of these control variables
447 had a significant statistical association with reporting of sexual orientations. But, the overall
448 discrepancy between the NHIS and GSS survey estimates still remained highly significant ($p <$
449 0.001) when these control variables are introduced into our multinomial model. In particular, the
450 GSS population estimates report 1.25 higher relative odds of reporting a gay/lesbian orientation
451 (vs. Straight) than the NHIS and 2.98 higher relative odds of reporting a bisexual (vs. Straight)
452 sexual orientation.

453

454 *4.2 Congruence of Estimated Association between Sexual Orientation and Sociodemographic* 455 *Predictors.*

456 Further analyses indicate that these inter-survey discrepancies do not contaminate
457 conclusions about the associations between sexual orientations and time or our other predictor
458 variables (birth cohort, education, etc.). The formal test of this hypothesis (Appendix Table A) fit
459 a multinomial model that included all five 3-way interactions of sexual orientation-by-predictor-
460 by-survey. None of these interactions were found to be statistically significant.

461 This result suggests that while the two survey programs *did not yield equivalent point*
462 *estimates* of the proportion of the USA population reporting different sexual orientations, the
463 survey programs do yield equivalent conclusions about changes in reporting of sexual
464 orientations over time and across subgroups of the USA population defined by birth cohort,
465 gender, education, and race.

466

468 **5. Implications**

469 The foregoing analyses demonstrate that these measurements of sexual orientation in the
470 US population meet a basic test for all scientific measurements. In particular, these two
471 independent series of measurements *do not show* statistically significant divergences in their
472 estimates of the *association* between variations in sexual orientations reported over time or their
473 association with the four other sociodemographic predictors included in our model. The
474 measurements themselves *do*, however, show statistically significant divergences in their point
475 estimates of the proportion of the U.S. population reporting different sexual orientations. In
476 particular, the General Social Survey produces markedly higher estimates of the proportion of the
477 U.S. population labeling themselves as bisexual.

478 These results have two implications for the use of these data. First, analysts can have
479 some confidence in conclusions regarding both trends over time and the *association* between
480 reported sexual orientation and sociodemographic factors regardless of which of these surveys
481 generated the data. Second, the significant variation observed in point estimates implies that it
482 would be foolhardy to *simply merge* estimates from these two surveys.

483

484 *5.1. Limitations*

485 As noted previously, our analysis benefits both from the large samples surveyed by each
486 survey program and the high-quality field operations that were used. We do note, however, three
487 serious limitations on our conclusions. First, our analysis was restricted to using only five
488 predictor variables: time, gender, birth cohort, education, and race. It is quite possible that we
489 might have reached different conclusions about the congruence of patterns of association if
490 different or additional sociodemographic predictors had been used. Second, our analysis of trends
491 over time is, by necessity, restricted to the three years in which the surveys' measurements
492 coincided (2014, 2016, 2018). Finally, our analysis does not provide a convincing explanation of
493 why the General Social Survey produced markedly higher estimates of the percent of U.S. adults

494 who report that they are bisexual. The Director of the GSS survey program has suggested that
495 this anomaly may reflect the impact of the GSS survey context, e.g., asking respondents to report
496 on the numbers of male and female sex partners they had since age 18 or the fact that bisexual
497 was the middle category in the GSS question (Tom Smith, personal communication, July 19,
498 2020). Future research should follow up on these speculations.

499

501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509

510

511

APPENDIX

513 **Appendix Table A. Multinomial logistic regression predicting relative risk of reporting a gay or bisexual (vs.**
 514 **straight) orientation as a function of the survey making the measurement, controlling for birth cohort and**
 515 **selected sociodemographic variables plus all survey-by-demographic interactions.**
 516

PREDICTOR	RESPONSE Gay - Lesbian			RESPONSE Bisexual			P Overall Effects (a)
	Coef. Relative Log Odds (a)	Relative Odds Ratio (a)	p	Coef. Relative Log Odds (a)	Relative Odds Ratio (a)	p	
SURVEY							
NHIS	ref			ref			
GSS	-1.429	0.240	0.218	1.398	4.048	0.061	0.039
GENDER							
Male	ref			ref			
Female	-0.252	0.777	0.001	0.889	2.433	<0.001	<0.001
YEAR OF SURVEY							
2014	ref			ref			
2016	-0.095	0.909	0.3	0.266	1.305	0.015	
2018	-0.040	0.961	0.663	0.447	1.563	<0.001	0.002
BIRTH COHORT							
1930 & earlier	ref			ref			
1940	0.394	1.483	0.073	0.185	1.204	0.612	
1950	0.882	2.415	<0.001	0.503	1.654	0.128	
1960	1.277	3.587	<0.001	0.780	2.182	0.012	
1970	1.138	3.119	<0.001	1.257	3.513	<0.001	
1980	1.198	3.313	<0.001	2.003	7.409	<0.001	
1990+*	1.394	4.030	<0.001	2.563	12.969	<0.001	<0.001
EDUCATION							
< High School Graduate	ref			ref			
HS Graduate	0.558	1.748	0.001	-0.266	0.766	0.158	
BA/BS	0.892	2.440	<0.001	-0.159	0.853	0.428	
Post-BA	1.231	3.423	<0.001	-0.183	0.833	0.409	<0.001
RACE							
White	ref			ref			
Black	0.088	1.092	0.396	-0.349	0.705	0.012	
Other	-0.304	0.738	0.038	-0.329	0.720	0.126	0.126
INTERACTIONS							
SURVEY by YEAR							
GSS & 2016	0.388	1.474	0.072	-0.236	0.790	0.356	
GSS & 2018	-0.047	0.954	0.861	-0.481	0.618	0.057	0.109
SURVEY by BIRTH COHORT							
GSS & 1940	1.879	6.544	0.074	-0.150	0.860	0.863	
GSS & 1950	1.311	3.708	0.229	-0.632	0.532	0.419	
GSS & 1960	1.060	2.888	0.317	0.029	1.030	0.968	
GSS & 1970	1.327	3.772	0.211	-0.493	0.611	0.5	
GSS & 1980	1.784	5.951	0.087	-0.341	0.711	0.627	
GSS & 1990	1.476	4.374	0.17	-0.397	0.672	0.587	0.388
SURVEY by GENDER							
GSS & Female	0.102	1.108	0.628	0.171	1.186	0.416	>0.500
SURVEY by EDUCATION							
GSS & HS Grad	0.163	1.177	0.781	0.004	1.004	0.991	
GSS & BA/BS	-0.059	0.942	0.919	0.179	1.196	0.657	
GSS & Grad	-0.199	0.820	0.747	0.428	1.534	0.314	>0.500
SURVEY by RACE							
GSS & Black	0.075	1.078	0.808	0.383	1.467	0.138	
GSS & Other	-0.300	0.740	0.445	0.181	1.198	0.613	>0.500
CONS.	-5.701	0.003	<0.001	-6.616	0.001	<0.001	

518

NOTE. Coefficients in Appendix Table A vary from those in Table 4 because the multinomial logistic regression model estimated for this table included additional predictor variables (i.e., the sexual *orientation by predictor by survey* interactions) beyond those for the main effects included in the model estimated for Table 4.

519

(a) Estimates derived by multinomial logistic regression accounting for complex design of samples. Coefficients indicate the estimated relative log odds of reporting Gay-Lesbian (or Bisexual) associated with being in the row category (e.g., female) of the predictor variable compared to the base category (e.g., male) when controlling for other factors in the model. The exponentiated value of this coefficient is the corresponding relative odds ratio. For rare attributes, this value is close to the relative risk ratio.

520

522 **Appendix Table B. Estimates of sexual orientation (a) of U.S. population derived from: (1) complete 2013-18**
 523 **NHIS adult probability sample, and (2) same sample excluding persons not residing in households.**
 524

Sample		Gay/Lesbian	Straight	Bisexual	Unweighted Ns
NHIS full sample	<i>est.</i>	1.64%	97.39%	0.96%	183,020
	<i>se</i>	0.04%	0.05%	0.03%	
NHIS Household Sample (b)	<i>est.</i>	1.64%	97.41%	0.95%	181,281
	<i>se</i>	0.04%	0.05%	0.03%	

(a) Analysis excludes persons providing a non-substantive response, e.g., Don't Know.

(b) Excludes NHIS cases whose living quarters were coded as: Not housing unit; Quarters not HU in rooming or boarding house; Unit not permanent in transient hotel, motel, etc.; Unoccupied site for mobile home, trailer or tent; Student quarters in college dormitory; Other group quarter; Other unit - not specified; Other unit - kind unknown; Unknown - Not ascertained. Overall, less than one percent of analysis sample was non-household respondents (unweighted n = 1,739 of 183,020).

525

References

- 1 Laumann EO, Gagnon JH, Michael RT, Michaels S. The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1994.
- 2 Johnson AM, Wadsworth J, Wellings K, Field J. Sexual attitudes and lifestyles. London: Blackwell Scientific; 1994.
- 3 Lhomond B, Saurel-Cubizolles MJ, Michaels S; CSF Group. A multidimensional measure of sexual orientation, use of psychoactive substances, and depression: results of a national survey on sexual behavior in France. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2014;43(3):607-619.
- 4 Bogaert AF, Liu J (2013) Physical size and sexual orientation: Analysis of the Chinese Health and Family Life Survey. *Arch Sex Behav* 42(8): 1555-1559.
- 5 Cantril H (1940) Experiments in the wording of questions. *Public Opin Q* 4: 330-332.
- 6 Bradburn NM, Sudman S, Blair E, Locander W, Miles C, Singer E et al. Improving interview method and questionnaire design: Response effects to threatening questions in survey research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1979.
- 7 Schuman H, Presser S. Questions and answers in attitude surveys: Experiments on question form, wording, and context. New York: Academic Press; 1996.
- 8 Sudman S, Bradburn NM. Response Effects in Surveys: A Review and Synthesis. Chicago: Aldine; 1974.
- 9 Turner CF, Martin E, editors. Surveying subjective phenomena. New York: Russell Sage; 1984.
- 10 Smith TW, Davern M, Freese J, Morgan SL (2019) General Social Surveys, 1972-2018.[machine-readable data file and codebook].
- 11 NCHS - National Center for Health Statistics. 2018 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS): Public Use Data Release: Survey Description, National Health Interview Survey, 2018. Hyattsville, Maryland: NCHS; June, 2019.
- 12 Blewett LA, Drew JAR, King ML, Williams KC (2019). IPUMS Health Surveys: National Health Interview Survey, Version 6.4 [data set]. Minneapolis MN: IPUMS, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D070.V6.4>.
- 13 Smith TW, Davern M, Freese J, Hout M. General Social Surveys, 1972-2018: Cumulative codebook. Chicago: NORC; 2019.
- 14 NORC (National Opinion Research Center) (2018) GSS Ballot 1 English (Questionnaire) published online at: https://gss.norc.umd.edu/Documents/quex/GSS2018_Ballot_English.pdf, accessed 3/27/2022.
- 15 Turner CF, Ku L, Rogers SM, Lindberg LD, Pleck JH, Sonenstein FL (1998). Adolescent sexual behavior, drug use, and violence: increased reporting with computer survey technology. *Science* 280(5365): 867-873.

- 17 Villarroel MA, Turner CF, Rogers SM, Roman AM, Cooley PC, Steinberg AB et al (2008) T-ACASI reduces bias in STD measurements: the National STD and Behavior Measurement Experiment. *Sex Transm Dis* 35(5): 499-506.
- 18 Dahlhamer JM, Galinsky AM, Joestl SS, Ward BW (2014) Sexual orientation in the 2013 National Health Interview Survey: A quality assessment. *Vital Health Stat* 2(169).
- 19 National Opinion Research Center (2019) Appendix A: Sampling design and weighting. In Smith, TW, Davern M, Freese J, Hout M. *General Social Surveys, 1972-2018: cumulative codebook*. Chicago: NORC; 2019.
- 20 StataCorp. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 15*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC' 2017.
- 21 Turner CF, Villarroel MA, Chromy JR., Eggleston E, Rogers SM (2005). Same-gender sex among US adults: Trends across the twentieth century and during the 1990s. *Public Opin Q* 69(3): 439-462.
- 22 England P, Mishel E, Caudillo ML (2016). Increases in sex with same-sex partners and bisexual identity across cohorts of women (but not men). *Sociological Science* 3:951-970.
- 23 Kinsey AC, Pomeroy WB, Martin CE. *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: Saunders; 1948.
- 24 Cochran WG, Mosteller F, Tukey JW (1953). Statistical problems of the Kinsey report. *J Am Stat Assoc* 48(264): 673-716.
- 25 Kinsey AC, Pomeroy WB, Martin CE, Gebhard PH. *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: Saunders; 1953.
- 26 Institute of Medicine (IOM). *Confronting AIDS: Directions for public health, health care, and research*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 1986.
- 27 Turner CF, Miller HG, Moses LE, editors. *AIDS: Sexual behavior and intravenous drug use*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press; 1989.
- 28 Miller HG, Turner CF, Moses LE, editors. *AIDS: The second decade*. Washington D.C.: National Academies Press; 1990.
- 29 Laumann EO, Michael RT, Gagnon JH (1994). A political history of the national sex survey of adults. *Fam Plan Perspect* 26(1): 34-38.