Muñoz S., Ercio; Sansone, Dario; Ysique, Mayte

Working Paper

Socioeconomic disparities in Latin America among same-sex and different-sex couples

IDB Working Paper Series, No. IDB-WP-01726

Provided in Cooperation with:
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), Washington, DC

Suggested Citation: Muñoz S., Ercio; Sansone, Dario; Ysique, Mayte (2025) : Socioeconomic disparities in Latin America among same-sex and different-sex couples, IDB Working Paper Series, No. IDB-WP-01726, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), Washington, DC, https://doi.org/10.18235/0013582

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/324825

WORKING PAPER Nº IDB-WP-01726

Socioeconomic Disparities in Latin America among Same-Sex and Different-Sex Couples

Ercio A. Muñoz
Dario Sansone
Mayte Ysique

Inter-American Development Bank
Gender and Diversity

June 2025

Socioeconomic Disparities in Latin America among Same-Sex and Different-Sex Couples

Ercio A. Muñoz
Dario Sansone
Mayte Ysique

Inter-American Development Bank
Gender and Diversity

June 2025

Cataloging-in-Publication data provided by the
Inter-American Development Bank
Felipe Herrera Library
Muñoz, Ercio.
Socioeconomic disparities in Latin America among same-sex and different-sex couples/ Ercio A. Muñoz, Dario Sansone, Mayte Ysique.
p. cm. — (IDB Working Paper Series ; 1726)
Includes bibliographical references.
1. Sexual minorities-Demographic aspects-Latin America. 2. Sexual minorities-Social aspects-Latin America. 3. Demographic surveys-Latin America. I. Sansone, Dario. II. Ysique, Mayte. III. Inter-American Development Bank. Gender and Diversity Division. IV. Title. V. Series.
IDB-WP-1726

Socioeconomic Disparities in Latin America among Same-Sex and Different-Sex Couples♦

Ercio A. Muñoz♠

Dario Sansone♥*

Mayte Ysique♣

Abstract

Economic research on sexual minority individuals in low- and middle-income countries is limited due to the lack of representative data including information on sexual orientation. This paper uses census data from eight Latin American countries to explore socioeconomic disparities between same-sex and different-sex couples. Individuals in same-sex couples tend to be younger, less likely to identify as Indigenous, more educated, and less likely to live with children. Unemployment and income gaps vary by country. Individuals in same-sex couples have higher individual incomes in Brazil, while in Mexico women in same-sex couples earn more than they do in different-sex couples, but the opposite is true for men. Homeownership rates are lower among same-sex couples than among different-sex couples. Finally, asset-based welfare measures show mixed results: same-sex couples are overrepresented at the lower end of the distribution in some countries, while in others, they appear less frequently at the lower end.

Keywords: Latin America, LGBTQ+, inequality

JEL: B54**;** D10; I20; I32; J15; J70

♦ Financial support from the Inter-American Development Bank (ESW RG-E1952) is gratefully acknowledged. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Inter-American Development Bank. For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY NC ND) license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising. We would like to thank the Editor Elissa Braunstein, the associate editor, three anonymous referees, Caridad Araujo, Lee Badgett, and Laura Nettuno for their helpful comments. We also thank the conference participants at the 2024 AEA/ASSA Annual Meeting, AEA CSQIEP, Conference on Equality of Opportunity and Intergenerational Mobility, LGBTI+ Economic Development and Empowerment IAFFE Workshop, SCL data week, GeFam Meeting, and LACEA, as well as the seminar participants at the University of East Anglia, for their feedback. Finally, we thank Natalia Tosi for their excellent research assistance in the early stages of the project. All errors are our own.

♠ Inter-American Development Bank. E-mail: erciom@iadb.org.

♥ University of Exeter and IZA. E-mail: d.sansone@exeter.ac.uk.

* Corresponding author.

♣ Inter-American Development Bank. E-mail: maytes@iadb.org.

1. Introduction

A large and growing share of the global population identifies as LGBTQ+.[1] Indeed, in the United States, 7.2 percent of individuals identified as LGBTQ+ in 2023, up from 3.5 percent in 2012 (Jeffrey M. Jones 2023). Additionally, in 30 countries, an average of 8 percent identified as a sexual minority in 2023 (Chris Jackson 2023). However, many countries lack any statistics on the size, demographic characteristics, and socioeconomic status of this population. In response to this data need, high-income countries have gradually been adding questions on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) to their censuses and nationally representative surveys: for instance, countries such as the UK, Canada, and New Zealand have included SOGI questions in their latest censuses. In the US, an increasing number of surveys have been expanded to collect SOGI data (e.g., the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, the National Health Interview Survey, and the Household Pulse Survey). In addition, in many European countries, rich administrative data can now be leveraged to identify a large share of LGBTQ+ individuals. Complementing these sources, the World Bank's SOGI database offers a valuable cross-country resource, focusing on laws and regulations (World Bank 2024). This ongoing data revolution has contributed to the exponential growth in economic studies on LGBTQ+ issues in recent years (M.V. Lee Badgett et al. 2024).

On the other hand, SOGI data remain unavailable in most low- and middle-income countries, resulting in the continued exclusion of LGBTQ+ individuals from official statistics and policy considerations. This paper addresses these data limitations by merging and harmonizing microdata from the censuses of eight countries in Latin America: Argentina (collected in 2010), Brazil (2010), Chile (2017), Colombia (2018), Guatemala (2018), Mexico (2020), Peru (2017), and Uruguay (2011). For each country, individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples are identified based on each household member's sex and relationship with the household head. The resulting dataset is the largest one on same-sex couples and, more generally, on LGBTQ+ individuals in low- and middle-income countries, and it is one of the largest datasets of its kind globally. The vast geographical coverage is clear from Figure B1: the data from these eight countries include most of the region.

Regarding sample size, these data represent approximately 78 percent of the population in the region, including approximately 115,000 same-sex couples with 404,000 individuals living in

[1] The abbreviation LGBTQ+ refers to individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and to other sexual and gender minority people. Sexual orientation refers to one's sexual attraction, behavior, and/or identity. Individuals with same-sex attraction and/or same-sex sexual activity are generally referred to as sexual minority individuals, including lesbian women, gay men, bisexual people, and queer individuals (as are those who identify with one of these categories). In contrast, heterosexual or straight individuals are individuals who are attracted to and/or have sex with individuals of a different sex (as are those who identify as such). Gender identity refers to one's sense of being male, female, both, or neither. Gender minority individuals are individuals whose current gender does not match their sex assigned at birth. Cisgender individuals are people whose current gender aligns with their sex at birth. Gender minority individuals include transgender men, transgender women, and non-binary individuals, among others.

households headed by same-sex couples and approximately 26 million different-sex couples with nearly 102 million individuals living in households headed by different-sex couples.[2] Therefore, by harmonizing data across countries, it is possible to provide both new data on sexual minorities in same-sex couples in the region (in most cases, for the first time) and a comprehensive picture of socioeconomic disparities by couple type within and across countries. An additional advantage of such large sample sizes is the increased statistical power they provide, enabling detailed heterogeneity analyses. For example, census data are uniquely large enough to examine small subpopulations, such as Indigenous individuals in same-sex couples.

These Latin American countries are inherently interesting due to large variations across countries in economic conditions, attitudes towards sexual minorities, and LGBTQ+ rights. Therefore, the variety of countries included in this study provides a snapshot of socioeconomic disparities among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples at different economic and cultural stages, thereby increasing the external validity of the main findings. While it is important to highlight that the data used in the empirical analysis have been collected in different years and in different political and economic contexts, it is remarkable that several socioeconomic patterns and gaps are observed consistently across countries.

For most of the countries above, this study provides the first statistics on LGBTQ+ individuals. Therefore, even if individuals in same-sex couples represent a (selected) share of LGBTQ+ individuals – indeed, it is impossible to identify single LGBTQ+ individuals and partnership formation is nonrandom – analyzing data on same-sex couples is an important first step in addressing the historical invisibility of sexual and gender minorities. Furthermore, because a wide range of welfare policies, benefits, and rights is linked to marriage and relationship status (M.V. Lee Badgett et al. 2025) and given the central role of families in many Latin American countries, policymakers may be interested in any socioeconomic disparities between same-sex and different-sex couples. As an additional advantage of analyzing same-sex couples, these sexual minority individuals are identified indirectly through their sex and relationship to the household head, thus potentially increasing disclosure rates: some people may feel more comfortable answering these questions in a government survey than being asked about their sexual orientation.

Focusing first on demographic and family characteristics, this paper shows that although there are a few exceptions, both women and men in same-sex couples are, on average, younger than women and men in different-sex couples, respectively. In addition, individuals in same-sex couples are less likely to identify as Indigenous, although differentials for African descendants vary by country. Furthermore, they have higher educational levels, and they are less likely to live with children. Then, examining labor market outcomes, this paper finds that gaps in unemployment rates by couple type and sex differ by country, although in most cases, the unemployment rates are higher among individuals in same-sex couples than among individuals in different-sex couples.

[2] For comparison, Sansone (2019) used data from the 2000-2016 American Community Survey, the largest survey available in the US, to identify 46,141 same-sex couples.

Due to data limitations, only the individual income differentials in Brazil and Mexico can be examined. In Brazil, both women and men in same-sex couples have higher average incomes than women and men in different-sex couples, respectively. In Mexico, women in same-sex couples also have higher average incomes than women in different-sex couples, while men in same-sex couples have lower average incomes than men in different-sex couples.

The final section of the empirical analysis examines wealth and poverty, revealing that homeownership rates are lower among same-sex couples than among different-sex couples. Meanwhile, welfare differentials, as measured by an index based on asset ownership and dwelling characteristics, yield mixed results. In several countries, the shares of households in the bottom 40th percentile are lower or similar for same-sex couples relative to different-sex couples, while in two countries we find a much larger share of same-sex couples in the bottom. These differences, although inconclusive due to the heterogeneity in the information used to construct the index, are suggestive of heterogeneous welfare dynamics affecting these couples in the region.

2. Literature review and conceptual framework

This study contributes to a limited set of studies examining the economic outcomes for LGBTQ+ individuals in Latin America. The majority of this literature focuses on labor market outcomes in Brazil using data on same-sex couples from the 2010 census (Priscila Casari, Sandro Eduardo Monsueto, and Pedro Henrique Evangelista Duarte 2013; Marcio Veras Corrêa, Guilherme Irffi, and Daniel Suliano 2014; Wellington Romero Da Silva and Daniel Domingues Dos Santos 2016; Daniel Suliano et al. 2016; Paulo de Andrade Jacinto et al. 2017; Daniel Tomaz de Sousa and Cássio da Nóbrega Besarria 2018; Daniel Suliano, Guilherme Irffi, and Ana Beatriz Rêgo de Sá Barreto 2022), other nationally representative surveys allowing the identification of same-sex couples (Ana Luiza Neves de Holanda Barbosa et al. 2020; Daniel Suliano, Alexsandre Lira Cavalcante, and Luciana Rodrigues 2021; Daniel Suliano, Jaime De Jesus Filho, and Guilherme Irffi 2021; Gabriela Gomes Mantovani and Jefferson Andronio Ramundo Staduto 2023; Honorata Bogusz and Jan Gromadzki 2024; Jennifer Graves and Christopher Trond 2024), and more recent datasets that include information on sexual orientation (João Tampellini 2024).

For other countries, (Camila Brown, Dante Contreras, and Luis Schmidt 2019) analyzed data on same-sex couples in Chile and Uruguay,[3] while (Bogusz and Gromadzki 2024) did so for Uruguay. Furthermore, (DANE 2022) reported statistics on same-sex couples in Colombia, and (Laura Nettuno, Samuel Mann, and Gilbert Gonzales 2024) documented health disparities by sexual orientation in Chile. There is only one study from Chile that documents disparities by gender identity in the region (Laura Nettuno 2024). This paper thus builds on the previous literature by providing additional or updated statistics on same-sex couples in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Uruguay, and it provides the first statistics on same-sex couples for Argentina, Guatemala, Mexico,

[3] Unlike (Brown, Contreras, and Schmidt 2019), the analysis in this paper does not include the 2012 census in Chile because it was later found to have substantial data issues (INE 2014).

and Peru. Indeed, to the best of our knowledge, there are no other nationally representative studies on individuals in same-sex couples – or, more generally, sexual minority individuals – for most of these countries.[4]

The previous literature provides an additional reason to focus on Latin America: most of the studies in this region have used data on same-sex couples from Brazil and found positive income differentials for both women and men in same-sex couples. These findings are in contrast to evidence from other countries (Marieka Klawitter 2015; M.V. Lee Badgett, Christopher S. Carpenter, and Dario Sansone 2021). Thus, it is interesting to test whether positive or negative income and wage gaps by sexual orientation and/or couple type are found in other countries in the region, whenever such data are available.

There are different theoretical reasons why one may ex-ante expect to observe disparities between same-sex and different-sex couples, as well as across countries. The first one is that varying degrees of discrimination against sexual minorities may negatively impact socioeconomic outcomes for individuals in same-sex couples (Badgett et al. 2024). This could be due to taste-based discrimination (Gary S. Becker 1971): employers' preferences not to hire sexual minority individuals, or co-workers' and customers' distaste for interacting with these individuals. Statistical discrimination may also play a role if employers believe that sexual minority individuals would be less productive as employees (Michael Spence 1973). Employers may also be afraid of violating social norms and being punished if they hire minority workers (Marcin Pęski and Balázs Szentes 2013). In addition to these deliberate evaluations, several people may have unconscious biases leading to implicit discrimination (Marianne Bertrand et al. 2005).

Aside from these individual-level drivers, institutional factors such as outdated laws, legislative inertia, and organizational practices could lead to systemic discrimination (Mario L. Small and Devah Pager 2020). Institutional differences may also play a role in explaining variations across countries. Indeed, the Latin American countries considered in this study are at different steps of economic development: their GDP per capita ranges from less than USD 11,000 in Guatemala to more than USD 30,000 in Chile (World Bank 2023). Mexico joined the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), a club of mostly rich countries, in 1994, followed by Chile in 2010 and Colombia in 2020 (OECD 2023). On the other hand, Argentina has faced multiple economic crises in recent decades (World Bank 2018), while Peru has some economic strengths (e.g., the mining and tourism sectors) but has experienced years of political instability (Michael Stott 2023). As other studies have found that economic growth and business cycle

[4] It is also worth noting that, while not nationally representative, a few recent studies have conducted experiments on LGBTQ+ issues in Latin America (Emilio Gutiérrez and Adrian Rubli 2024; Andres Ham, Angela Guarin, and Juanita Ruiz 2024; Wladimir Zanoni et al. 2024). Other studies have instead focused on attitudes towards sexual and gender minorities (Selim Gulesci, María Lombardi, and Alejandra Ramos 2024; Ercio A. Muñoz, Ariel Listo, and Dario Sansone 2025). Our companion papers focus on survey data from Mexico and Chile to further document the barriers faced by LGBTQ+ and intersex individuals (Ercio A. Muñoz, Melanie Saavedra, and Dario Sansone 2024, 2025a, 2025b).

fluctuations affect discrimination against sexual minorities and overall LGBTQ+ rights (M.V. Lee Badgett, Kees Waaldijk, and Yana van der Meulen Rodgers 2019; Nick Drydakis 2022a), it is reasonable to expect these economic conditions to impact outcomes for sexual minorities individuals in these countries as well.

Within the institutional context, there is also considerable variation in the legislative framework on LGBTQ+ rights. For instance, almost all countries in the Global South that have legalized same-sex marriage are in Latin America (Miriam Marcén and Marina Morales 2022), but same-sex marriage is still illegal in countries such as Guatemala and Peru. Furthermore, several countries have experienced backlashes in the past few years, such as an increase in legislative and bureaucratic barriers for transgender individuals (CFR 2021) and the dismantling of the antidiscrimination agency in Argentina (Lucas Ramon Mendos and Dhia Rezki Rohaizad 2024). These policies – and backlashes – are likely to directly impact the ability of sexual minority individuals to participate in the labor market and contribute to society.

Relatedly, attitudes towards sexual minorities vary substantially across these Latin American countries, even among countries that are comparable in terms of economic activity. As shown in Figure B2, in 2018, most people supported same-sex marriage in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay, but marriage equality was still a controversial topic in Colombia, Guatemala, and Peru. There have been improvements in recent years, but they have been greater in Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay than in Colombia or Peru. Notably, the level of support for the legalization of same-sex marriage is higher in some of these countries than in the US (Jackson 2023). Similarly, Figure B3 shows differential support for sexual minority politicians across countries and over time. Additionally, over time, there has been an increase in support for sexual minority individuals running for office: the only notable exception is Argentina, where support declined between 2008 and 2018. One can therefore assume that these attitudes could affect socioeconomic outcomes for sexual minority individuals, with lower disparities between individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples expected in countries with more positive LGBTQ+ attitudes. Religious views – and related changes such as the rapid growth of Pentecostalism in Brazil (Marcela Mello and Giulia Buccione 2025) – can also have similar impacts. In addition, attitudes towards homosexuality among native cultures can influence socioeconomic disparities as well, especially in countries with large Indigenous populations.

An alternative channel that may drive differences between same-sex and different-sex couples is the extent of intra-household specialization. A substantial body of research suggests that same-sex couples tend to share household responsibilities more equally (Lisa Giddings et al. 2014; Thomas Hofmarcher and Erik Plug 2022). Cross-national differences in gender norms may further influence the degree of intra-household specialization across couple types. These household decisions are expected to affect outcomes such as labor force participation. In particular, traditional gender norms may reduce employment outcomes for women in different-sex couples, while having a more limited impact on women in same-sex couples.

It is then important to emphasize that, as already mentioned in the Introduction, this study focuses on individuals living together with a same-sex partner and reporting their relationship status in a government survey. This is a non-random subset of sexual minorities, so one needs to carefully consider how sample selection and disclosure may affect the main estimates. It is possible that individuals who are more economically successful may be more willing to be in a relationship and truthfully report that in the census. Depending on the prevailing norms and condition in a given country, individuals with lower education levels, racial and ethnic minorities, as well as women may have more or fewer opportunities to enter into a same-sex relationship and to be comfortable coming out (Badgett, Carpenter, and Sansone 2021). Consequently, socioeconomic disparities estimated by comparing same-sex and different-sex couples may underestimate the underlying gaps by sexual orientation if individuals are positively selected in the marriage market.

In conclusion, as also highlighted by other scholars (Brown, Contreras, and Schmidt 2019), while one may expect socioeconomic disparities between same-sex and different-sex couples in Latin America to be qualitatively similar to those estimated in Europe and the US, the size of the gaps may be different due to the factor discussed in this section, and may even reverse in case of strong positive selection into cohabitation, thus further motivating research on the characteristics of this population in the region.

3. Data and methodology

Aiming to characterize the demographic and socioeconomic differences between same-sex and different-sex couples in Latin America, this paper uses microdata from the decennial census of population and housing of eight countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay.[5] Except for Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay, for which data collection occurred in 2010/2011, the data were mostly collected at the end of the 2010s. For each country, Table 1 describes the sample size, the census year, the share of the full-count census being used, and the number of different-sex and same-sex couples identified. The samples for Argentina and Brazil were obtained from IPUMS-International (IPUMS 2020); Chile and Uruguay made their census microdata publicly available on their respective websites;[6] while the rest of the samples were obtained directly from the respective national statistical offices. All data are anonymous: thus, all personal information that would allow the identification of any person or person(s) described in this paper has been removed.

Building on previous research conducted for high-income countries (Dan A. Black, S. G. Sanders, and L. J. Taylor 2007; Badgett, Carpenter, and Sansone 2021), this paper identified a sample of

[5] Some countries in the region are excluded from the analysis because either they did not allow the identification of partners of the same sex (e.g., Ecuador 2010, El Salvador 2007) or the samples were too small to work with (e.g., Costa Rica 2011 and Suriname 2012).

[6] Census microdata for Chile and Uruguay can be accessed at https://www.ine.gob.cl/estadisticas/sociales/censos-de-poblacion-y-vivienda/censo-de-poblacion-y-vivienda (accessed: June 20, 2023) and https://www4.ine.gub.uy/Anda5/index.php/catalog/243/get-microdata (accessed: April 12, 2023), respectively.

same-sex and different-sex couples based on information about household members' relationship to the person identified as the household head. In particular, the main dataset includes information about the individual and housing characteristics of all people who were enumerated as a couple, where a couple is composed of a person identified as the household head and a person identified as the spouse or partner of the household head. After all these couples were identified, the information about the sex of each household member was used to classify the sample couples as different-sex (with a man or woman as head), male same-sex, or female same-sex couples.[7] Notably, previous research has shown that most individuals in same-sex couples are indeed in a romantic relationship (Christopher S. Carpenter 2004).

This paper identifies and counts the number of different types of couples in the eight countries above. Subsequently, the main analysis provides the basic characteristics of these individuals and their households using the information collected through the census questionnaire. For example, it explores the average size of these households, the presence of children, the place of residence, and basic sociodemographic characteristics such as age, nationality, level of education, and labor market status.[8] All variables are described in detail in Section A of the Online Appendix. Given the limited information about income or wealth that the census questionnaires collect, this paper characterizes economic status using other indicators, such as a wealth index based on ownership of different assets and dwelling characteristics. In the cases where individual income information is collected (Brazil and Mexico), this study also explores income gaps based on couple type, controlling for basic demographic factors.

The main results exploit full-count census microdata for Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Peru, and Uruguay (see Table 1); in these cases, the analysis is conducted without the need to use survey weights. Similarly, the 10% sample for Argentina does not require weighting, as it was drawn to make each observation self-weighted.[9] However, in the cases of Mexico and Brazil, the dataset corresponds to the sample that received the long questionnaire in the census operation, and it requires the use of survey weights to make it representative of the population.

[7] See Section A of the Online Appendix for the definition of household head used in each census questionnaire and for the details about the categories used in each census questionnaire for the relationship to the household head, as well as summary statistics (Tables A1-A8). All census questionnaires used in this paper contain a question about sex with two response options (male or female). Since it is not possible to distinguish between sex and gender, the discussion of the empirical analysis uses "female individual" and "woman" interchangeably. The same holds true for "male individual" and "man". The identification of same-sex and different-sex couples is by no means free of measurement error because misreporting of sex for household members can occur, as illustrated by the cases of the censuses in the United States in 2010 (Daphne A. Lofquist and Jamie M. Lewis 2015) and Mexico in 2010 (Albert Esteve and Anna Turu Sánchez 2014). For this reason, some countries explicitly ask about the sex of the spouse or partner, such as Chile in 2012, Brazil in 2010, and Uruguay in 2011.

[8] Matching patterns by age, ethnicity, and education among same-sex and different-sex couples are explored in a companion paper (Ercio A. Muñoz and Dario Sansone 2024).

[9] See the description of the sample provided by IPUMS (accessed: December 5, 2023): https://international.ipums.org/international-action/sample_details/country/ar#tabar2010a.

4. Results

4.1 Demographics

Figure 1 compares the average age of women and men in same-sex and different-sex couples. In all countries, men in same-sex couples are younger than men in different-sex couples. This finding is in line with the previous literature and evidence from other countries (Badgett, Carpenter, and Sansone 2021). Similarly, with the exception of Argentina, women in same-sex couples have a lower average age than women in different-sex couples. The age difference among men by couple type is always larger than the difference among women, but all these gaps are statistically significant (Table B1).

Figure 2 and Table B2 report statistics by ethnicity. The share of Indigenous people is very low for both same-sex and different-sex couples in Brazil. The gap between same-sex and different-sex couples is also small in Chile and Colombia. On the other hand, in the countries where Indigenous people are more prevalent, women and men in same-sex couples are less likely to be Indigenous than women and men in different-sex couples. Interestingly, the only country where the opposite is true is Uruguay. Similar gaps between men and women in same-sex and different sex couples are also found when looking at the share of people who speak an Indigenous language (Table B3). Given the variety of attitudes towards sexual and gender minorities among ancient and non-Western societies (Badgett et al. 2024), future studies should investigate how different historical levels of acceptance among Indigenous groups influence current LGBTQ+ attitudes and identification among ethnic minority individuals.

Individuals in same-sex couples in Uruguay are also more likely to identify as African descendants than both women and men in different-sex couples (Figure 3 and Table B4). The same holds true in Peru and Colombia, although the size of the gap is smaller. In Brazil, where a large share of individuals identifies as African descendants, the sign of the differential is reversed.

Unsurprisingly, since sexual minority individuals are more likely to migrate to escape from intolerant environments, women and men in same-sex couples are more likely to be migrants than individuals in different-sex couples (Figure 4). Most of these migrants are from other Latin American countries (Table B5)

The Online Appendix provides additional descriptive statistics on the demographic composition of same-sex and different-sex couples. Men in same-sex couples are less likely to report disabilities than men in different-sex couples, while the size and sign of the differential by couple type among women vary by country (Figure B4). Despite the long-term negative health effects of minority stress due to homophobic attitudes reported in Figures B2-B3, it is likely that the age differentials reported in Figure 1 partly explain these gaps in disability rates.

4.2 Human capital

Figure 5 reports educational levels by sex and couple type. In line with the previous literature (Badgett, Carpenter, and Sansone 2021), both women and men in same-sex couples are more likely to have completed some post-secondary education. The size of the differential varies by country: it is larger in Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay and smaller in Mexico and Peru, but all differences are statistically significant (Table B6). Similar conclusions can be reached by comparing the average years of education for individuals in same-sex versus different-sex couples (Figure B5), by using more detailed educational categories (Table B7 and Figures B6-B9), or after controlling for age and ethnicity (Figure B10).

It is remarkable that qualitatively similar differences can be found across such a varied range of countries. Furthermore, similar educational advantages have been found in high-income countries (Badgett et al. 2024). Several explanations have been proposed to explain such gaps, although no study to date has been able to fully disentangle and rule out potential drivers. For instance, sexual minority individuals may be more likely to attend college since these colleges and universities usually provide a more welcoming environment. These individuals could also sort into white-collar jobs, which typically require a post-secondary degree, since they may expect to experience less discrimination in such jobs. Differences in intrahousehold specialization between same-sex and different-sex couples could also play a role, especially for sexual minority women who may not expect to specialize in home production and who may thus invest more in their own education. Alternatively, it is possible that highly educated sexual minority individuals may be more likely to have a same-sex partner and be comfortable declaring this in a government survey.[10]

4.3 Family

Different factors lead to higher childbearing and childrearing costs for individuals in same-sex couples. For example, men in same-sex couples mainly rely on surrogacy and adoption: these procedures can be expensive and are not tolerated (or are even banned) in many countries. Similarly, prohibitive medical costs, as well as policies restricting access to in vitro fertilization, may impose additional burdens on women in same-sex couples hoping to become pregnant. Living in a country that does not recognize same-sex relationships creates further barriers and disincentives to childbearing among sexual minority individuals. Such binding constraints support the findings in Figure 6 that, compared to different-sex couples, a lower share of same-sex couples have children in their households. These differences are statistically significant in all countries (Table B8) and persist after controlling for demographic characteristics and educational levels (Figure B11).

[10] Importantly, data on more recent cohorts or young sexual minority individuals do not always confirm such an educational advantage (Dario Sansone 2019b).

Typically, sexual minority men face higher societal, biological, and legislative barriers to and costs of having children, which explains the lower share of gay men than lesbian women living with a child in their household in the US and other high-income countries (Badgett, Carpenter, and Sansone 2021). The lower percentages of men in same-sex couples living with a child than women in same-sex couples in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Peru, and Uruguay (Figure 6) are thus consistent with previous studies. Differently, there are fewer differences in childrearing among women and men in same-sex couples in Guatemala and Mexico, where, if anything, men in same-sex couples are more likely to live with a child.

Figures B12 and B13 disaggregate Figure 6 by showing couples living in households with children but with no other adults and with other adults, respectively. Specifically, for couples without other adults in the household (Figure B12), the disparities between same-sex and different-sex couples and between women and men in same-sex couples are similar to those shown in Figure 6. Differently, for couples with other adults in the household (Figure B13), very few couples (both same-sex and different-sex couples) cohabit with children and other adults in Brazil. In addition, women in same-sex couples are more likely than individuals in different-sex couples to live in households with children and other adults in Colombia, while there are small differences by couple type in Mexico. Future research (including qualitative studies) could further investigate the potential drivers of these differences in family composition across countries.

Finally, in line with the idea that sexual minority individuals may face stigma and rejection from members of their extended family, as well as the higher childbearing costs mentioned above, individuals with a same-sex partner are much more likely to reside in nuclear families (that is, households without any cohabiting person other than their partner) than individuals coupled with a different-sex individual (Figure B14).

4.4 Labor market

4.4.1 Employment

The first LGBTQ+ studies in economics analyzed labor market disparities by sexual orientation (M.V. Lee Badgett 1995). Since then, the field of LGBTQ+ economics has significantly expanded, but analyses of labor market outcomes still constitute a significant amount of the literature (Badgett et al. 2024). Apart from a few exceptions highlighted in the introduction, most of these studies focus on high-income countries. Therefore, it is particularly interesting to analyze differences in employment and earnings by couple type in our sample. Nevertheless, when interpreting these comparisons, it is worth remembering that positive selection among same-sex couples is likely to particularly affect these estimates. In other words, it is plausible that only the most successful sexual minority individuals would have the resources, knowledge, and confidence to openly live with a same-sex partner and truthfully report their relationship status in the census.

Regarding labor market outcomes, it is first important to highlight that due to gender norms and intrahousehold specialization, women in different-sex couples have the lowest labor force participation rates (Figure B15). This gender gap is more prevalent in Colombia, Guatemala, and Mexico, but it is present in all countries. Women in same-sex couples tend to have a more equal division of household work and are less subject to gender norms, thus leading to higher labor force participation rates for these women than for women in different-sex couples (but still lower than the corresponding rates for men in different-sex couples). Men in same-sex couples are also less likely to participate in the labor market than men in different-sex couples, especially in Colombia, Guatemala, and Mexico. The size of the differential is smaller in Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, and it is even reversed (by approximately two percentage points) in Brazil. A comparison of employment rates provides a similar picture (Figure B16). In line with these gender differences, both household heads and partners/spouses in same-sex couples are more likely to be working than those in different-sex couples in all countries (Figure B17), thus suggesting lower levels of within-household labor specialization among same-sex couples, potentially reflecting differences in gender norms or economic decision-making processes.

The unemployment rate estimates further show that even when individuals in same-sex couples actively participate in the labor market and look for jobs, they are less likely to find one (Figure 7). Indeed, men in same-sex couples have substantially higher unemployment rates than men in different-sex couples in Argentina, Colombia, Peru, and Uruguay. This differential is small but still statistically significant in Chile, while it is not statistically significant in Guatemala (Table B9). The gap is very narrow in Mexico and reversed in Brazil. Most of these disparities persist after controlling for demographic and educational differences – although in Brazil men in same-sex couples are more likely to be unemployed once accounting for such observable characteristics (Figure B18).

For women, the differentials in unemployment rates by couple type vary by country (Figure 7). Women in same-sex couples are less likely to be unemployed in Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Uruguay, while the opposite holds true in Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, and Mexico. The same is true after controlling for demographic and educational differences (Figure B18). One could speculate that especially in countries with strong gender norms, only the women with the strongest skills and grit (as well as a supportive partner) would enter the labor market, thus leading to positive selection and low unemployment among these highly productive women in different-sex couples. Differently, women in same-sex couples may face different kinds of discrimination in different contexts, for example, positive discrimination due to expected lower fertility rates and more (perceived) masculine traits and negative discrimination due to employers' prejudice against sexual minority employees, thus having mixed effects on the unemployment rates of these women.

4.4.2 Individual Income

Most countries do not collect data on earnings and individual income in their census. Thus, the analysis of income differentials by couple type needs to be restricted to only two countries: Brazil and Mexico. Brazil has information about the total gross monthly income that a person received, as well as earned income (i.e., total income from labor), and Mexico has information about monthly labor earnings.

Therefore, based on the available limited data, Figure B19 reports the unadjusted weighted distribution of (log) individual income in Brazil. Panel A compares the distribution of income for women in same-sex and different-sex couples, while Panel B focuses on men. In line with the previous studies mentioned in the introduction that use data from the 2010 census but in contrast to findings in the international context, the income distribution for both women and men in same-sex couples is shifted to the right compared to that for women and men in different-sex couples, respectively. In fact, in 2010, the weighted average income in Brazil for women in same-sex couples was BRL 1,728, higher than the BRL 744 average income for women in different-sex couples and close to the BRL 1,687 average income for men in different-sex couples, while the average for men in same-sex couples was BRL 3,486.

Figure B20 reports the same weighted individual income distribution but for Mexico. While the distribution of income for women in same-sex couples is also shifted to the right of the distribution for women in different-sex couples (although less than the shift in Brazil), there are more overlaps in the income distributions for men in same-sex and different-sex couples. On average, in 2020, the weighted income in Mexico for women in same-sex couples was MXN 7,325, MXN 5,517 for women in different-sex couples, MXN 6,675 for men in different-sex couples, and MXN 7,145 for men in same-sex couples.

To examine these income differentials in greater depth, Table 2 reports the estimates from multivariate analyses. The following standard Mincer equation can be estimated by ordinary least squares (OLS) for each individual *i* and separately for each country and sex:

$$y_{is} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 SSC_{is} + \gamma_2 x'_{is} + \mu_s + \varepsilon_{is}$$

where the dependent variable y_{is} is individual *i*'s income (living in state *s*). Both household heads and their partners or spouses are included in the analysis. The sample is restricted to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years who were working and reported income greater than zero. One can then test whether and how a binary indicator for being in a same-sex couple (SSC_i) is associated with income. In addition to the constant term (γ_0), the other main regressors are individual-level controls (x_{is}): the respondent's age (and age squared), race, ethnicity, and education; their partner's or spouse's characteristics; and a binary variable indicating the presence of at least one child living in the household. All regressions include state fixed effects (μ_s) as well. Standard

errors (ε_{is}) clustered at the household level are used throughout, as are individual weights. The full estimation results are reported in Table B10.

Columns 1-4 report estimates for Brazil, while Columns 5-6 use data from Mexico. Odd-numbered columns (Columns 1, 3, and 5) estimate individual income differentials between women in same-sex and different-sex couples, while even-numbered columns (Columns 2, 4, and 6) compare men in same-sex and different-sex couples. The dependent variable in Columns 3-4 and in Columns 5-6 is the logarithm of labor income in Brazil and in Mexico, respectively. For Brazil, it is also possible to focus on gross monthly personal income (Columns 1-2).

Examining the coefficients of the same-sex couple indicator, this study observes that the estimates in Columns 1-4 confirm previous findings in Brazil of an income premium for both women and men in same-sex couples compared to women and men in different-sex couples, respectively. The income premium for women in same-sex couples is approximately 19-20 log points (20.4-21.9 percent) while the corresponding premium for men is approximately 9-10 log points (8.9-10.8 percent). To check the robustness of these findings, Tables B11-B12 use the logarithm of one plus income and earnings, respectively, as the dependent variable not to exclude those with zero income, following (Jennifer Graves and Christopher Trond 2024), as well as different sample restrictions. The income premium for women in same-sex couples persists across the different specifications, while the one for men in same-sex couples becomes negative and insignificant only when expanding the regression sample to include people not in the labor force. The estimated income gaps remain comparable when including occupational fixed effects (Table B13).

To the best of our knowledge, the results in Columns 5-6 are the first estimates of labor income differentials by couple type in Mexico. These estimates are qualitatively similar to those from the international literature: a labor income premium for women in same-sex couples, and a labor income disadvantage for men in same-sex couples. The income premium for women in same-sex couples is approximately 28 log points (33.3 percent) while the income penalty for men is approximately 11 log points (10.1 percent). Notably, although these estimates are not directly comparable due to differences in the outcome variable and sample, they are higher than those found in other (mostly high-income) countries, especially for women. Indeed, one meta-analysis found an average negative income or wage gap of 11 percent for gay/bisexual men after adjusting for other covariates and a positive gap of 9 percent for lesbian and bisexual women (Klawitter 2015). Furthermore, a more recent meta-analysis found a negative gap of 7 percent for gay men, a 10 percent negative gap for bisexual men, a 7 percent positive gap for lesbian women, and a 5 percent negative gap for bisexual women (Nick Drydakis 2022b).

Table B14 reports an Oaxaca-Blinder-Kitagawa decomposition based on these income regressions. While it is important to acknowledge the limitations of this approach (Maria Karamessini and Elias Ioakimoglou 2007), it is worth noting that the decomposition for women in Brazil shows a relatively balanced contribution from both the explained and unexplained components. For men,

however, the income gap is primarily driven by the explained factor. Conversely, for men in Mexico, a majority of the income penalty appears to be driven by differences in returns to characteristics, or the unexplained component.

4.5 Wealth and poverty

Since housing represents a major component of wealth for most households, Figure 8 and Table B15 examine the proportion of couples who own their home by type of couple and sex. Across countries, homeownership rates for same-sex couples are significantly smaller than those for different-sex couples. Comparing same-sex couples by sex, the results vary by country: Argentina and Peru show higher homeownership rates for women in same-sex couples, while the opposite holds true in Uruguay and Mexico, and the differences are negligible in Brazil and Guatemala. Lower homeownership rates have also been found for sexual minority individuals in high-income countries (Karen Leppel 2007; Badgett et al. 2024). Scholars have noted that differences in observable characteristics such as age, household income, one's preference for living in city centers, and the presence of children could partially explain these gaps. However, other studies have emphasized that limited access to credit markets and discrimination in mortgage applications may impose additional barriers for sexual minority individuals (Christopher A. Jepsen and Lisa K. Jepsen 2009; Hua Sun and Lei Gao 2019). The gap in homeownership rates persists even after controlling for demographic factors and education levels (Figure B21), as well as geographical fixed effects (Figure B22), suggesting that the other factors may play a more important role in this context.

The analysis of disparities in welfare requires income or consumption data, which are typically collected with a detailed questionnaire that captures all sources of income in a reference period and/or the consumption/expenditure on a large number of items (Angus Deaton and Salman Zaidi 2002; Giulia Mancini and Giovanni Vecchi 2022). However, census questionnaires often lack questions about wealth, income, or expenditure and instead collect information such as ownership of a given (usually small) set of assets and characteristics of the dwelling. Hence, with these limitations in mind, we explore differences in welfare by type of couple using an asset index as a proxy for welfare. The asset index is constructed by weighting a group of indicators by means of principal component analysis, as has been done in the literature (Deon Filmer and Lant H. Pritchett 2001; David McKenzie 2005; Deon Filmer and Kinnon Scott 2012). The set of indicators includes households' ownership of certain assets such as a refrigerator, telephone, cellphone, computer, tv, and dwelling; access to the internet or municipal water lines, among others; and dwelling characteristics such as the housing type (house, apartment, other), the number of rooms, and the dwelling construction materials, among others (see Table A14 for the availability of indicators by country).

To assess what type of household is more likely to be "poor" for a given threshold,[11] such as the 40th percentile according to this asset index, households are ranked based on the value of the index after partialling out the effect of the household head's age (and its square), race/ethnicity, region, and educational attainment, as well as the characteristics of the partner (age, race/ethnicity, and education). In other words, households are ranked according to the residuals of a regression of the asset index on these demographic characteristics of the household head and partner/spouse. The sample considers only households where both the household head and partner/spouse are aged between 18 and 64 years. Figures B23 and B24 display histograms of the asset index by country before and after partialling out the effect of these variables.

The differences in the share of households in the bottom 40 percent by couple type vary by country (Table 3). In Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, and Peru, same-sex couples are less likely to be "poor", in some cases with large differences (e.g., men in Brazil and women in Guatemala). In contrast, same-sex couples are more likely to be "poor" in Chile and Uruguay, in both cases by more than 20 percentage points. Finally, mixed results are found in Argentina and Mexico. In both cases, households with female same-sex couples are less likely to be poor, in contrast to households with male same-sex couples, which are more likely, although by small magnitudes (often statistically insignificant). Examining the share of households below the 20th, 30th, and 50th percentiles provide qualitatively similar results (see Tables B16-B18).

More research is needed to fully explain these mixed results. Nonetheless, these findings are likely related to the degree of potential sample selection (i.e., only partnered individuals are observed), as well as the higher labor market participation observed in same-sex couples, especially in the case of women.

5. Conclusion

This paper provides several statistics on the sociodemographic characteristics of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples across eight Latin American countries. A few patterns are highlighted: individuals in same-sex couples are, on average, younger, are less likely to identify as Indigenous (differentials for African descendants vary by country), have higher educational levels, and are less likely to live with children. The differentials in unemployment rates by couple type and sex vary by country. Furthermore, the individual income differentials in Brazil and Mexico are examined. In Brazil, both women and men in same-sex couples have higher average incomes than women and men in different-sex couples, respectively. In Mexico, women in same-sex couples also have higher average incomes than women in different-sex couples, while men in same-sex couples have lower average incomes than men in different-sex couples. Finally, homeownership rates are shown to be lower among same-sex couples, despite their higher welfare, as proxied by an asset index, in several countries.

[11] For the US, this question is addressed in (Alyssa Schneebaum and M.V. Lee Badgett 2019).

These findings represent an important first step toward addressing the historical lack of recognition and representation of LGBTQ+ individuals in low- and middle-income countries, with significant policy implications. LGBTQ+ individuals are often stigmatized – at best, they are disregarded and ignored, believed not to exist; at worst, they are persecuted. Due to the exclusion of sexual orientation and gender identity questions from nationally representative surveys, LGBTQ+ health and economic disparities remain overlooked: inaction by policymakers can create vicious cycles and have negative effects on overall poverty rates, inequality, and public health. When reliable information is missing, unfounded myths – for example, on the affluence of gay and lesbian individuals (M.V. Lee Badgett 2001) – can be easily spread. In the most striking cases, politicians exploit data limitations, as well as the lack of familiarity with these topics among the general population, to use LGBTQ+ individuals as scapegoats and to gain popularity by passing homophobic and transphobic laws. Not only is this status quo unfair and unethical from a human rights perspective, but negative attitudes and anti-LGBTQ+ policies also prevent individuals from achieving their full potential and lead to large national economic costs (M.V. Lee Badgett 2020).

Even when countries begin to adopt LGBTQ+-friendly policies and laws, the lack of quantitative data hinders researchers from accurately estimating the impacts of these policies. Therefore, future research could benefit from additional data from new censuses and nationally representative surveys to estimate the impact of LGBTQ+ policies in Latin America, as well as the effects of general policies on LGBTQ+ individuals (Christopher S. Carpenter and Dario Sansone 2021; Christopher S. Carpenter et al. 2021). Indeed, there are several examples of LGBTQ+ policies that have been implemented in recent years that need to be evaluated, ranging from the decriminalization of same-sex sexual activities (Riccardo Ciacci and Dario Sansone 2023) and the legalization of same-sex marriages to antidiscrimination laws and employment quotas for transgender individuals. Among researchers and policymakers, there is growing interest in this type of evaluation, but systematic and consistent data on sexual orientation and gender identity are a necessary condition to generate reliable causal estimates of LGBTQ+ policies

As already mentioned, one limitation of this study is that it is impossible to identify all sexual minority individuals: this paper cannot report socioeconomic statistics for sexual minority individuals who are single or in a non-cohabiting relationship. Furthermore, it is impossible to identify transgender individuals and other gender minorities. In addition, as noted in (Nettuno 2024), homeless individuals are difficult to capture in survey data; thus, if homelessness disproportionately affects LGBTQ+ individuals in Latin America, the survey estimates are likely to underestimate any economic disadvantage. While the reported estimates on same-sex couples are still important and relevant for policymakers, as more countries include direct questions on sexual orientation and gender identity in their national surveys and censuses, future studies could investigate the socioeconomic disparities between sexual minority and heterosexual individuals (including those not cohabiting with a partner) and between transgender and cisgender individuals.

In particular, it would be interesting to test whether selection into a partnership may explain some of the results reported in the previous section. For instance, the income advantage reported for

individuals in same-sex couples in Brazil may be due to specific societal factors (such as religious views and the rise of Pentecostalism in the country), as well as positive selection into a partnership. If the latter is true, then scholars should analyze the main drivers of such selection, such as homophobic attitudes in the general population. Policymakers may also worry that only a selected and privileged share of sexual minority individuals could afford to be in a same-sex relationship and be comfortable enough to disclose this in government surveys. Regular data collections would also allow researchers to test whether socioeconomic disparities are changing over time and how they are affected by business cycle fluctuations and political shifts.

References

Badgett, M.V. Lee. 1995. "The Wage Effects of Sexual Orientation Discrimination." *ILR Review* 48 (4): 726–739.

Badgett, M.V. Lee. 2001. *Money, Myths, and Change: The Economic Lives of Lesbians and Gay Men*. University of Chicago Press.

Badgett, M.V. Lee. 2020. *The Economic Case for LGBT Equality: Why Fair and Equal Treatment Benefits Us All*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Badgett, M.V. Lee, Christopher S. Carpenter, Maxine J. Lee, and Dario Sansone. 2024. "A Review of the Economics of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity." *Journal of Economic Literature* 62 (3): 948–994.

Badgett, M.V. Lee, Christopher S. Carpenter, Maxine J. Lee, and Dario Sansone. 2025. "Effects of Legal Access to Same-Sex Marriage." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 41 (1): 266294.

Badgett, M.V. Lee, Christopher S. Carpenter, and Dario Sansone. 2021. "LGBTQ Economics." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 35 (2): 141–170.

Badgett, M.V. Lee, Kees Waaldijk, and Yana van der Meulen Rodgers. 2019. "The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: Macro-Level Evidence." *World Development* 120 (August). Elsevier Ltd: 1–14.

Barbosa, Ana Luiza Neves de Holanda, Carolina Lopes de Carvalho Vita, Felipe Mendonça Russo, and Joana Simões Costa. 2020. "Rendimentos e Jornada de Trabalho Remunerado e Não Remunerado No Brasil: Uma Análise Por Orientação Sexual." *Notas Técnicas* 68: 65–79.

Becker, Gary S. 1971. *The Economics of Discrimination*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bertrand, Marianne, Dolly Chugh, Sendhil Mullainathan, Dan Black, David Neumark, Shelly Lundberg, and Kerwin Charles. 2005. "Implicit Discrimination." *American Economic Review* 95 (2): 94–98.

Black, Dan A., S. G. Sanders, and L. J. Taylor. 2007. "The Economics of Lesbian and Gay Families." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21 (2): 53–70.

Bogusz, Honorata, and Jan Gromadzki. 2024. "Labor Market Outcomes of Same-Sex Couples in Countries with Legalized Same-Sex Marriage." *Working Paper*.

Brown, Camila, Dante Contreras, and Luis Schmidt. 2019. "Sexual Orientation and Labor Force Participation: Findings from Chile and Uruguay." *Feminist Economics* 25 (2): 90–115.

Carpenter, Christopher S. 2004. "New Evidence on Gay and Lesbian Household Incomes." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 22 (1): 78–94.

Carpenter, Christopher S., Gilbert Gonzales, Tara McKay, and Dario Sansone. 2021. "Effects of the Affordable Care Act Dependent Coverage Mandate on Health Insurance Coverage for

Individuals in Same-Sex Couples." *Demography* 58 (5): 1897–1929.
Carpenter, Christopher S., and Dario Sansone. 2021. "Cigarette Taxes and Smoking Among Sexual Minority Adults." *Journal of Health Economics* 79 (September): 102492.
Casari, Priscila, Sandro Eduardo Monsueto, and Pedro Henrique Evangelista Duarte. 2013. "Impacto Da Orientação Sexual Sobre o Rendimento Do Trabalho." *Anais Do XL Encontro Nacional de Economia*, 1–18.
CFR. 2021. "Are Latin American Nations Turning Their Backs on LGBTQ+ Rights?" *Council on Foreign Relations* 2 (9).
Ciacci, Riccardo, and Dario Sansone. 2023. "The Impact of Sodomy Law Repeals on Crime." *Journal of Population Economics* 36: 2519–2548.
Corrêa, Marcio Veras, Guilherme Irffi, and Daniel Suliano. 2014. "Existe Diferencial Entre Casais Heterossexuais E Homossexuais? Uma Abordagem Para O Mercado De Trabalho Brasileiro." *Anais Do XLI Encontro Nacional de Economia*, 1–20.
Da Silva, Wellington Romero, and Daniel Domingues Dos Santos. 2016. "Trabalho E Bem-Estar: Uma Comparação Entre Casais Heterossexuais E Homoafetivos Brasileiros." *Anais Do XLIII Encontro Nacional de Economia*, 1–20.
DANE. 2022. "Caracterización Demográfica y Socioeconómica de Los Hogares de Parejas Del Mismo Sexo En Colombia." *Estudios Poscensales de Jóvenes Investigadores*, 1–50.
Deaton, Angus, and Salman Zaidi. 2002. "Guidelines for Constructing Consumption Aggregates for Welfare Analysis." *LSMS Working Paper* 135: 1–104.
Drydakis, Nick. 2022a. "Sexual Orientation Discrimination in the Labor Market against Gay Men." *Review of Economics of the Household* 20 (3): 1027–1058.
Drydakis, Nick. 2022b. "Sexual Orientation and Earnings: A Meta-Analysis 2012–2020." *Journal of Population Economics* 35 (2). Springer Berlin Heidelberg: 409–440.
Esteve, Albert, and Anna Turu Sánchez. 2014. "México : ¿Paraíso Homosexual o Problemas de Registro?" *Coyuntura Demográfica* 5: 39–45.
Filmer, Deon, and Lant H. Pritchett. 2001. "Estimating Wealth Effects without Expenditure Data—or Tears: An Application to Educational Enrollments in States of India." *Demography* 38 (1): 115–132.
Filmer, Deon, and Kinnon Scott. 2012. "Assessing Asset Indices." *Demography* 49 (1): 359–392.
Giddings, Lisa, John M. Nunley, Alyssa Schneebaum, and Joachim Zietz. 2014. "Birth Cohort and the Specialization Gap Between Same-Sex and Different-Sex Couples." *Demography* 51 (2). Duke University Press: 509–534.
Graves, Jennifer, and Christopher Trond. 2024. "Employment Discrimination and Labor Market Protections for Sexual Minorities in Brazil." *Labour Economics* 90 (October): 102548.
Gulesci, Selim, María Lombardi, and Alejandra Ramos. 2024. "Telenovelas and Attitudes toward the LGBTQ+ Community in Latin America." *Labour Economics* 87 (April): 102488.
Gutiérrez, Emilio, and Adrian Rubli. 2024. "LGBT+ Persons and Homophobia Prevalence across Job Sectors: Survey Evidence from Mexico." *Labour Economics* 87 (April): 102500.
Ham, Andres, Angela Guarin, and Juanita Ruiz. 2024. "How Accurately Are Household Surveys Measuring the LGBT Population in Colombia? Evidence from a List Experiment." *Labour Economics* 87 (April): 102503.
Hofmarcher, Thomas, and Erik Plug. 2022. "Specialization in Same-Sex and Different-Sex Couples." *Labour Economics* 77 (August). North-Holland: 101995.
INE. 2014. "Auditoría Técnica a La Base de Datos Del Levantamiento Censal Año 2012." *Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas*.

IPUMS. 2020. “Minnesota Population Center. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, International: Version 7.3 [Dataset].” Minneapolis, MN. https://doi.org/10.18128/D020.V7.3.

Jacinto, Paulo de Andrade, Gustavo Saraiva Frio, Daniel de Abreu Pereira Uhr, and Júlia Gallego Ziero Uhr. 2017. “Offer of Work and Sexual Orientation: Evidence of Brazil.” *Empirical Economics Letters* 16 (7): 663–667.

Jackson, Chris. 2023. “LGBT+ Pride 2023: A 30-Country Ipsos Global Advisor Survey.” *Ipsos*.

Jepsen, Christopher A., and Lisa K. Jepsen. 2009. “Does Home Ownership Vary by Sexual Orientation?” *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 39 (3). Elsevier B.V.: 307–315.

Jones, Jeffrey M. 2023. “U.S. LGBT Identification Steady at 7.2%.” *Gallup*.

Karamessini, Maria, and Elias Ioakimoglou. 2007. “Wage Determination and the Gender Pay Gap: A Feminist Political Economy Analysis and Decomposition.” *Feminist Economics* 13: 31–66.

Klawitter, Marieka. 2015. “Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Sexual Orientation on Earnings.” *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 54 (1): 4–32.

Leppel, Karen. 2007. “Home-Ownership among Opposite- and Same-Sex Couples in the US.” *Feminist Economics* 13 (1): 1–30.

Lofquist, Daphne A., and Jamie M. Lewis. 2015. “Improving Measurement of Same-Sex Couples.” *U.S. Census Bureau*, 1–23.

Mancini, Giulia, and Giovanni Vecchi. 2022. “On the Construction of a Consumption Aggregate for Inequality and Poverty Analysis.” *World Bank Group* 169327: 1–185.

Mantovani, Gabriela Gomes, and Jefferson Andronio Ramundo Staduto. 2023. “The Rainbow Reality: Income Difference and Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Occupations.” *International Journal of Manpower* 44 (5): 825–858.

Marcén, Miriam, and Marina Morales. 2022. “Same-Sex Marriage/Partnership.” In *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*, edited by Klaus F. Zimmermann, 1–20. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

McKenzie, David. 2005. “Measuring Inequality with Asset Indicators.” *Journal of Population Economics* 18 (June). Springer: 229–260.

Mello, Marcela, and Giulia Buccione. 2025. “Religious Media, Conversion, and Its Socio-Economic Consequences: The Rise of Pentecostals in Brazil.” *Working Paper*.

Mendos, Lucas Ramon, and Dhia Rezki Rohaizad. 2024. “Laws on Us: A Global Overview of Legal Progress and Backtracking on Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and Sex Characteristics.” *ILGA World*.

Muñoz, Ercio A., Ariel Listo, and Dario Sansone. 2025. “Measuring the Sources of Taste-Based Discrimination Using List Experiments.” *Working Paper*.

Muñoz, Ercio A., Melanie Saavedra, and Dario Sansone. 2024. “Socio-Economic Disparities by Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Mexico.” *IDB Working Paper*, 1–21.

Muñoz, Ercio A., Melanie Saavedra, and Dario Sansone. 2025a. “The Lives of Intersex People: Socioeconomic and Health Disparities in Mexico.” *PNAS Nexus* 4 (5): pgaf126.

Muñoz, Ercio A., Melanie Saavedra, and Dario Sansone. 2025b. “Intersex People and Household Income: Evidence from a Nationally Representative Survey in Chile.” *Working Paper*.

Muñoz, Ercio A., and Dario Sansone. 2024. “Matching Patterns among Same-Sex and Different-Sex Couples in Latin America.” *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 114.

Nettuno, Laura. 2024. “Gender Identity, Labor Market Outcomes, and Socioeconomic Status: Evidence from Chile.” *Labour Economics* 87: 102487.

Nettuno, Laura, Samuel Mann, and Gilbert Gonzales. 2024. “Sexual Orientation Based Health Disparities in Chile.” *PLoS ONE* 19 (1): e0296923.
OECD. 2023. “Our Global Reach: Members and Partners.” *OECD*.
Pęski, Marcin, and Balázs Szentes. 2013. “Spontaneous Discrimination.” *American Economic Review* 103 (6): 2412–2436.
Sansone, Dario. 2019a. “Pink Work: Same-Sex Marriage, Employment and Discrimination.” *Journal of Public Economics* 180 (December): 104086.
Sansone, Dario. 2019b. “LGBT Students: New Evidence on Demographics and Educational Outcomes.” *Economics of Education Review* 73 (December): 101933.
Schneebaum, Alyssa, and M.V. Lee Badgett. 2019. “Poverty in US Lesbian and Gay Couple Households.” *Feminist Economics* 25 (1). Routledge: 1–30.
Small, Mario L., and Devah Pager. 2020. “Sociological Perspectives on Racial Discrimination.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 34 (2). American Economic Association: 49–67.
Sousa, Daniel Tomaz de, and Cássio da Nóbrega Besarria. 2018. “Diferencial de Rendimentos e Orientação Sexual Na Região Nordeste.” *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Regionais e Urbanos* 12 (4): 417–435.
Spence, Michael. 1973. “Job Market Signaling.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 87 (3): 355–374.
Stott, Michael. 2023. “Peru Pulls Back from the Brink but Path to Growth Is Rocky.” *Financial Times*, October 20.
Suliano, Daniel, Alexsandre Lira Cavalcante, and Luciana Rodrigues. 2021. “Sexual Orientation in Brazil Using Unconditional Quantile Regression.” *Economia e Sociedade, Campinas* 30 (1(71)): 259–285.
Suliano, Daniel, Jaime De Jesus Filho, and Guilherme Irffi. 2021. “Sexual Orientation and Wage Differentials Using Anthropometric and Health Measures.” *Estudos Econômicos (São Paulo)* 51 (1). Departamento de Economia; Faculdade de Economia, Administração, Contabilidade e Atuária da Universidade de São Paulo (FEA-USP): 111–142.
Suliano, Daniel, Guilherme Irffi, Márcio V. Corrêa, Alexsandre Calvancante, and Jimmy Oliveira. 2016. “Orientação Sexual e Diferencial de Salários No Mercado de Trabalho Brasileiro.” *Economia Aplicada* 13 (1): 195–222.
Suliano, Daniel, Guilherme Irffi, and Ana Beatriz Rêgo de Sá Barreto. 2022. “Orientação Sexual e Seus Efeitos No Mercado de Trabalho: Um Estudo Com Base Na Técnica de Revisão Sistemática.” *Revista Brasileira De Estudos De População* 39: 1–29.
Sun, Hua, and Lei Gao. 2019. “Lending Practices to Same-Sex Borrowers.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 116 (19): 9293–9302.
Tampellini, João. 2024. “Latin American Pride: Labor Market Outcomes of Sexual Minorities in Brazil.” *Journal of Development Economics*, no. 167: 103239.
World Bank. 2018. “Argentina : Escaping Crises, Sustaining Growth, Sharing Prosperity.” *World Bank*.
World Bank. 2023. “GDP per Capita, PPP (Current International $).” *World Bank Open Data*.
World Bank. 2024. “Equality of Opportunity for Sexual and Gender Minorities 2024.” *World Bank*.
Zanoni, Wladimir, Hugo Hernández, Omar Zambrano, and Gabriel Quiroz. 2024. “Discrimination against Lesbian and Gay Job Seekers: An Artefactual Field Experiment in Urban Ecuador.” *Labour Economics* 88 (June): 102531.

Figure 1: Average age of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Age is in years at the time of the interview. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. The couples in which the household head or the partner/spouse is under 18 years old represent only 0.71% of the total sample. Colombia has age coded in 5-year bins, which were replaced with the midpoints. See also Table B1. Weighted statistics.

Figure 2: Indigenous rates among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Individuals are classified as Indigenous via a self-identification question. See Online Appendix A for details about the original census questions and categories. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. Information about ethnicity is not available for Argentina. See also Table B2.

Figure 3: African descendant rates among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Individuals are classified as African descendants via self-identification questions. See Online Appendix A for details about the original census questions and categories. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. Information about race is not available for Argentina or Chile. See also Table B4.

Figure 4: Share of migrants among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: A migrant is defined as a person born in a different country. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics.

Figure 5: Educational level of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: This figure considers whether individuals completed at least one year of formal education at the higher education level (regardless of degree completion). The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. See also Table B6.

Figure 6: Childrearing by couple type



Note: Children are any individuals younger than 18 cohabiting with the main couple (i.e., the head of household and their spouse or partner). The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. See also Table B8.

Figure 7: Unemployment rates among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: The unemployment rate is defined as the share of individuals who did not work during the previous week among those who are part of the labor force. The sample is restricted to individuals aged 18 to 64 years. Weighted statistics. See also Table B9.

Figure 8: Homeownership rates by couple type



Note: Homeownership is defined at the household level and indicates whether a household member owns the dwelling (without specifying the owner). The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. Chile and Colombia are not included because information about ownership of the dwelling is not available. See also Table B15.

Table 1: Sample descriptive statistics

Country	Year	Census sample (%)	Population in the sample	Different-sex couples	Female same-sex couples	Male same-sex couples
Argentina	2010	10	3,966,245	727,471	1,402	984
Brazil	2010	10	20,635,472	4,121,736	2,972	2,332
Chile	2017	100	17,574,003	3,094,164	7,106	8,009
Colombia	2018	100	46,754,581	7,494,104	26,506	21,428
Guatemala	2018	100	15,665,122	2,325,745	271	372
Mexico	2020	10	15,015,683	2,675,919	11,951	23,573
Peru	2017	100	29,381,884	4,505,071	3,998	2,797
Uruguay	2011	100	3,285,877	638,230	493	819
Total			152,278,867	25,582,440	54,699	60,314

Note: Unweighted statistics. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old.

Table 2: Individual income gaps by couple type

	Brazil				Mexico	
	Income		Earnings		Earnings	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Same sex	0.198***	0.102***	0.186***	0.085***	0.288***	-0.106***
	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.009)	(0.006)
Observations	1,828,224	2,919,186	1,789,642	2,912,198	663,301	1,719,783
R-squared	0.413	0.443	0.425	0.446	0.295	0.236
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mean log of income	6.655	6.990	6.588	6.935	8.259	8.596

Note: Weighted statistics. Robust standard errors clustered at the couple level are in parentheses. The dependent variable is the natural logarithm of income or earnings. The sample is restricted to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years who were working and reported an income greater than zero. The regressions include state fixed effects, as well as household head and partner characteristics (age, educational level, and race/ethnicity), and a binary variable indicating the presence of at least one child living in the household. Full estimation results are reported in Table B10. See also the notes in Figures B19-B20. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 3: Share of households in the bottom 40 percent by couple type

	Different-sex couples	Female same-sex couples	Male same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)-(1)	(3)-(1)
Argentina	40.00%	37.62%	40.78%	-0.02	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)		
Brazil	40.02%	35.81%	29.50%	-0.04***	-0.11***
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)		
Chile	39.89%	50.78%	65.79%	0.11***	0.26***
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)		
Colombia	40.02%	33.32%	38.75%	-0.07***	-0.01***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)		
Guatemala	40.00%	30.43%	32.62%	-0.10***	-0.07***
	(0.00)	(0.03)	(0.03)		
Mexico	40.02%	35.26%	39.63%	-0.05***	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)		
Peru	40.01%	38.88%	33.00%	-0.01	-0.07***
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)		
Uruguay	39.99%	53.97%	60.71%	0.14**	0.21**
	(0.00)	(0.06)	(0.09)		

Note: Households in each country are ranked according to the value of an asset index (after partialling out the effect of age, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, and state), which is defined as a weighted average of a set indicators reflecting ownership of assets, access to certain services, and dwelling characteristics (see Table A14) and constructed via principal component analysis. The sample is restricted to couples with both individuals aged between 18 and 64 years. Weighted statistics. Robust standard errors are reported in brackets. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Online Appendix (NOT MEANT FOR PUBLICATION)

Appendix A. Variable description.

Sex reports whether the person was male or female. Our data do not allow us to distinguish between sex and gender.

Each household contains an individual designated as the household head (see Table A9 for the details about the definition of household head in each country). All other household members report their relationship to the head according to a pre-defined set of categories (Tables A10-A11). Couples are identified when an individual reports being the spouse or partner of the head. In the case of Uruguay, there is a question about partnership that identifies married status as well as unions with partners of same or different sex. To make the sample fully comparable to that from other countries, this variable has not been used to identify couples.

Age reports the respondent's age in years at the time of the interview, except for Colombia, where age is reported in 5-year bins (0-4, 5-9, …, 95-99, 100+), which are replaced with the midpoint of each bin.

In the sample, households where both members of the couple are under 18 years old have been excluded.

Ethnicity and race. Ethnicity is a multidimensional concept that can be measured by a diverse set of approaches, including ethnic ancestry or origin, ethnic identity, cultural origins, nationality, race, color, minority status, language, religion, or various combinations thereof. The countries in the main sample asked individuals to self-identify, phrasing the question to include some of the concepts listed above. There are 2 ways in which these questions were asked: a yes/no question about belonging to a group and self-identification with one of a set of groups. In the latter case, there is a set of possible answers that vary by country. Responses have been grouped into three categories: "Indigenous," "African descendant," and "neither Indigenous nor African descendant."

In the case of Chile and Mexico, as shown in Table A12, respondents were asked a yes/no question about belonging to any Indigenous people or to the African descendant community (the questionnaire in Chile asked about only Indigenous status). In this case, respondents were categorized as Indigenous or as African descendants if they answered "yes" to the respective question, and those who answered no to both questions were categorized as "neither Indigenous or African descendant".

Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Peru, and Uruguay asked the question of ethnicity based on whether respondents felt identified with any group from a list. This list is classified into the three categories according to Table A13.

Importantly, Brazil and Uruguay incorporate supplementary inquiries in their classification methods. In Brazil, an additional yes/no query is presented to individuals who do not self-identify as Indigenous, asking whether they consider themselves Indigenous. Those answering affirmatively are also categorized as Indigenous.

In Uruguay, the question adopts a multiple-choice format. An additional question seeks to identify the primary ethnicity in cases where individuals identify with multiple ethnicities. This supplementary question complements the primary classification, aiding in the delineation of the predominant ethnic affiliation.

Education is described by three indicators. The first is the number of years of schooling, which is calculated according to the highest completed grade and duration of the different levels within the educational system of each country. It is available for all countries except Brazil and Colombia. The second indicator is a binary variable indicating whether the respondent had at least one year of post-secondary education. The third indicator is the highest level completed, which is categorized into four options: "no education/incomplete primary," "primary education," "secondary education," and "tertiary education." In the case of Colombia, it is impossible to determine whether a person was able to finish tertiary education; thus, this indicator captures tertiary education in a way similar to the second indicator.

Type of household identifies a household as belonging to one of the categories below according to the number of members and the presence of children:

- Nuclear family: Households with a spouse and without children or other relatives or non-relatives.
- Household with only children: This household consists of a head, a spouse, and children. Neither other relatives nor non-relatives reside in this household.
- Household without children but with other adults: This household is composed of other relatives and non-relatives. No children reside in this household.
- Household with children and other adults: This household consists of a head, a spouse, other relatives, non-relatives, and children.

Childbearing identifies a household with the presence of a child. This includes the "*household with only children*" and "*household expanded with children and other adults*" categories.

In this study, only monogamous couples were included in the sample to ensure the consistency and reliability of the main findings. In Mexico and Brazil, 1,127 and 105 households have two or more partners, respectively.

Labor force participation reports whether a person was in the working-age population and worked or had the willingness to work in the reference period.

Employment reports those who worked at least one hour in the reference period (in general, the week or the month preceding the survey interview) or those who, having a job, had not worked due to extenuating circumstances (sick leave, strike, vacation, etc.).

Unemployment reports those who did not work for at least one hour in the reference period but who were available to work and had taken concrete steps to find work.

Occupation variable that indicates the primary occupation code of the respondent, based on the national occupation classification system used in each country. The variable is used at the 1-digit level, corresponding to the major occupational groups as defined by each country's classification system. This variable is only used for Brazil and Mexico.

Individual Income is a continuous variable that indicates total and labor income in the national currency. This information is available only for the 2020 census of Mexico and 2010 census of Brazil. In Mexico, the monthly labor income for the principal job is available only when the following question is asked: *"How much does (NAME) earn in that job?"* In Brazil, both labor and total income are available. Labor income reports the total income from all jobs in July 2010, and two questions are used to calculate this variable: *"In your main job, what was your usual gross monthly income (or withdrawal) in July 2010?"* and *"In other jobs, what was your usual gross monthly income (or withdrawal) in July 2010?"* Total income includes labor income, retirement, pension, social programs, transfers, and other sources (savings interest, financial applications, rent, pensions or private pension retirement, etc.).

Homeownership indicates whether the house is reported to belong to a member of the household (whether fully or partially paid for).

Migrants are captures via a dichotomous variable that indicates whether the person was born in the country of the census.

People with disabilities are identified using questions similar to the Washington Group Short Set on Functioning, where individuals report having at least some difficulty performing certain activities. More details can be found at https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/question-sets/wg-short-set-on-functioning-wg-ss/.

Assets are dichotomous variables that indicate whether the household owns any tangible or intangible items that hold economic value and contribute to the household's living standards, comfort, and functionality. See the full list in Table A14.

Table A1: Sample descriptive statistics – Argentina (2010 census)

Variable	Obs	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
DEMOGRAPHICS						
Sex						
Men	1,459,714	0	1	0.500	0	0.500
Women	1,459,714	0	1	0.500	1	0.500
Couples						
Different-sex couple	729,857	0	1	0.997	1	0.057
Male same-sex couple	729,857	0	1	0.001	0	0.037
Female same-sex couple	729,857	0	1	0.002	0	0.044
Age	1,459,714	12	98	45.693	44	15.242
Race and ethnicity						
Indigenous	Missing					
African descendant	Missing					
Other ethnicities	Missing					
Migrants	1,459,714	0	1	0.063	0	0.243
People with disabilities	Missing					
EDUCATION						
Years of schooling	1,459,714	0	18	9.744	9	4.569
At least one year in tertiary	1,459,714	0	1	0.222	0	0.416
Level of education						
No education	1,459,714	0	1	0.147	0	0.354
Primary education	1,459,714	0	1	0.511	1	0.500
Secondary education	1,459,714	0	1	0.173	0	0.378
Post-secondary education	1,459,714	0	1	0.169	0	0.375
LABOR MARKET						
Participation rate	1,264,386	0	1	0.776	1	0.417
Employment rate	1,267,068	0	1	0.743	1	0.437
Unemployment rate	981,553	0	1	0.041	0	0.199
Labor income	Missing					
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS						
Type of household						
Nuclear family	729,857	0	1	0.225	0	0.417
Household with only children	729,857	0	1	0.408	0	0.491
Household without children	729,857	0	1	0.158	0	0.365
Household with children and other adults	729,857	0	1	0.209	0	0.407
Homeownership	729,857	0	1	0.736	1	0.441

Note: unweighted statistics

Table A2: Sample descriptive statistics – Brazil (2020 census)

Variable	Obs	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
DEMOGRAPHICS						
Sex						
Men	8,254,080	0	1	0.500	0	0.500
Women	8,254,080	0	1	0.500	1	0.500
Couples						
Different-sex couple	4,127,040	0	1	0.999	1	0.036
Male same-sex couple	4,127,040	0	1	0.001	0	0.024
Female same-sex couple	4,127,040	0	1	0.001	0	0.027
Age	8,254,080	10	98	43.475	42	14.714
Race and ethnicity						
Indigenous	8,253,711	0	1	0.005	0	0.067
African descendant	8,253,711	0	1	0.489	0	0.500
Other ethnicities	8,253,711	0	1	0.506	1	0.500
Migrants	8,254,080	0	1	0.003	0	0.054
People with disabilities	8,252,476	0	1	0.316	0	0.465
EDUCATION						
Years of schooling	Missing					
At least one year in tertiary	8,254,080	0	1	0.108	0	0.311
Level of education						
No education	8,254,080	0	1	0.450	0	0.498
Primary education	8,254,080	0	1	0.258	0	0.438
Secondary education	8,254,080	0	1	0.213	0	0.410
Post-secondary education	8,254,080	0	1	0.078	0	0.269
LABOR MARKET						
Participation rate	7,403,535	0	1	0.724	1	0.447
Employment rate	7,435,261	0	1	0.648	1	0.478
Unemployment rate	5,363,240	0	1	0.102	0	0.302
Labor income	7,435,261	0	1,906,523	999.516	510	3,552.721
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS						
Type of household						
Nuclear family	4,127,040	0	1	0.209	0	0.407
Household with only children	4,127,040	0	1	0.745	1	0.436
Household without children	4,127,040	0	1	0.010	0	0.097
Household with children and other adults	4,127,040	0	1	0.036	0	0.187
Homeownership	4,118,864	0	1	0.755	1	0.430

Note: unweighted statistics

Table A3: Sample descriptive statistics – Chile (2017 census)

Variable	Obs	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
DEMOGRAPHICS						
Sex						
Men	6,218,558	0	1	0.500	1	0.500
Women	6,218,558	0	1	0.500	0	0.500
Couples						
Different-sex couple	3,109,279	0	1	0.995	1	0.070
Male same-sex couple	3,109,279	0	1	0.003	0	0.051
Female same-sex couple	3,109,279	0	1	0.002	0	0.048
Age	6,218,558	15	100	48.204	47	14.931
Race and ethnicity						
Indigenous	6,115,929	0	1	0.117	0	0.322
African descendant	Missing					
Other ethnicities	6,115,929	0	1	0.883	1	0.322
Migrants	6,168,360	0	1	0.049	0	0.215
People with disabilities	Missing					
EDUCATION						
Years of schooling	6,094,877	0	21	11.150	12	4.216
At least one year in tertiary	6,166,751	0	1	0.282	0	0.450
Level of education						
No education	6,094,966	0	1	0.102	0	0.302
Primary education	6,094,966	0	1	0.300	0	0.458
Secondary education	6,094,966	0	1	0.360	0	0.480
Post-secondary education	6,094,966	0	1	0.238	0	0.426
LABOR MARKET						
Participation rate	5,205,092	0	1	0.749	1	0.434
Employment rate	5,261,052	0	1	0.706	1	0.455
Unemployment rate	3,898,090	0	1	0.047	0	0.211
Labor income	Missing					
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS						
Type of household						
Nuclear family	3,109,279	0	1	0.230	0	0.421
Household with only children	3,109,279	0	1	0.336	0	0.472
Household without children	3,109,279	0	1	0.198	0	0.398
Household with children and other adults	3,109,279	0	1	0.236	0	0.424
Homeownership	Missing					

Note: unweighted statistics

Table A4: Sample descriptive statistics – Colombia (2018 census)

Variable	Obs	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
DEMOGRAPHICS						
Sex						
Men	15,084,076	0	1	0.500	0	0.500
Women	15,084,076	0	1	0.500	1	0.500
Couples						
Different-sex couple	7,542,038	0	1	0.994	1	0.079
Male same-sex couple	7,542,038	0	1	0.003	0	0.053
Female same-sex couple	7,542,038	0	1	0.004	0	0.059
Age	15,084,076	12	100	45.181	42	15.160
Race and ethnicity						
Indigenous	15,028,180	0	1	0.039	0	0.193
African descendant	15,028,180	0	1	0.063	0	0.242
Other ethnicities	15,028,180	0	1	0.899	1	0.302
Migrants	15,043,901	0	1	0.018	0	0.133
People with disabilities	Missing					
EDUCATION						
Years of schooling	Missing					
At least one year in tertiary	15,000,121	0	1	0.242	0	0.428
Level of education						
No education	15,000,121	0	1	0.050	0	0.218
Primary education	15,000,121	0	1	0.293	0	0.455
Secondary education	15,000,121	0	1	0.415	0	0.493
Post-secondary education	15,000,121	0	1	0.242	0	0.428
LABOR MARKET						
Participation rate	13,076,438	0	1	0.675	1	0.469
Employment rate	13,297,739	0	1	0.619	1	0.486
Unemployment rate	8,820,354	0	1	0.067	0	0.250
Labor income	Missing					
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS						
Type of household						
Nuclear family	7,542,038	0	1	0.194	0	0.395
Household with only children	7,542,038	0	1	0.452	0	0.498
Household without children	7,542,038	0	1	0.144	0	0.351
Household with children and other adults	7,542,038	0	1	0.210	0	0.407
Homeownership	Missing					

Note: unweighted statistics

Table A5: Sample descriptive statistics – Guatemala (2018 census)

Variable	Obs	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
DEMOGRAPHICS						
Sex						
Men	4,652,776	0	1	0.500	1	0.500
Women	4,652,776	0	1	0.500	0	0.500
Couples						
Different-sex couple	2,326,388	0	1	1.000	1	0.017
Male same-sex couple	2,326,388	0	1	0.000	0	0.013
Female same-sex couple	2,326,388	0	1	0.000	0	0.011
Age	4,652,776	12	124	42.369	40	14.767
Race and ethnicity						
Indigenous	4,652,776	0	1	0.419	0	0.493
African descendant	4,652,776	0	1	0.002	0	0.042
Other ethnicities	4,652,776	0	1	0.579	1	0.494
Migrants	4,595,695	0	1	0.008	0	0.088
People with disabilities	4,631,305	0	1	0.142	0	0.349
EDUCATION						
Years of schooling	4,652,776	0	21	5.364	5	4.879
At least one year in tertiary	4,652,776	0	1	0.062	0	0.242
Level of education						
No education	4,652,776	0	1	0.509	1	0.500
Primary education	4,652,776	0	1	0.343	0	0.475
Secondary education	4,652,776	0	1	0.103	0	0.304
Post-secondary education	4,652,776	0	1	0.045	0	0.206
LABOR MARKET						
Participation rate	4,204,330	0	1	0.564	1	0.496
Employment rate	4,220,242	0	1	0.554	1	0.497
Unemployment rate	2,372,819	0	1	0.014	0	0.119
Labor income	Missing					
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS						
Type of household						
Nuclear family	2,326,388	0	1	0.093	0	0.291
Household with only children	2,326,388	0	1	0.469	0	0.499
Household without children	2,326,388	0	1	0.101	0	0.301
Household with children and other adults	2,326,388	0	1	0.337	0	0.473
Homeownership	2,326,388	0	1	0.813	1	0.390

Note: unweighted statistics

Table A6: Sample descriptive statistics – Mexico (2020 census)

Variable	Obs	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
DEMOGRAPHICS						
Sex						
Men	5,422,886	0	1	0.502	1	0.500
Women	5,422,886	0	1	0.498	0	0.500
Couples						
Different-sex couple	2,711,443	0	1	0.987	1	0.114
Male same-sex couple	2,711,443	0	1	0.009	0	0.093
Female same-sex couple	2,711,443	0	1	0.004	0	0.066
Age	5,422,886	12	98	46.074	45	15.196
Race and ethnicity						
Indigenous	5,420,035	0	1	0.373	0	0.484
African descendant	5,420,035	0	1	0.027	0	0.161
Other ethnicities	5,420,035	0	1	0.600	1	0.490
Migrants	5,420,682	0	1	0.004	0	0.059
People with disabilities	5,420,095	0	1	0.230	0	0.421
EDUCATION						
Years of schooling	5,415,074	0	24	7.583	9	4.630
At least one year in tertiary	5,419,620	0	1	0.097	0	0.296
Level of education						
No education	5,411,504	0	1	0.269	0	0.444
Primary education	5,411,504	0	1	0.506	1	0.500
Secondary education	5,411,504	0	1	0.123	0	0.328
Post-secondary education	5,411,504	0	1	0.102	0	0.302
LABOR MARKET						
Participation rate	4,677,307	0	1	0.598	1	0.490
Employment rate	4,697,992	0	1	0.579	1	0.494
Unemployment rate	2,797,594	0	1	0.028	0	0.165
Labor income	2,731,424	0	999,998	6,368.469	5000	14,639.33
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS						
Type of household						
Nuclear family	2,711,443	0	1	0.171	0	0.377
Household with only children	2,711,443	0	1	0.416	0	0.493
Household without children	2,711,443	0	1	0.133	0	0.340
Household with children and other adults	2,711,443	0	1	0.280	0	0.449
Homeownership	2,704,649	0	1	0.786	1	0.410

Note: unweighted statistics

Table A7: Sample descriptive statistics – Peru (2017 census)

Variable	Obs	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
DEMOGRAPHICS						
Sex						
Men	9,023,732	0	1	0.500	0	0.500
Women	9,023,732	0	1	0.500	1	0.500
Couples						
Different-sex couple	4,511,866	0	1	0.998	1	0.039
Male same-sex couple	4,511,866	0	1	0.001	0	0.025
Female same-sex couple	4,511,866	0	1	0.001	0	0.030
Age	9,023,732	12	114	45.515	44	15.091
Race and ethnicity						
Indigenous	8,887,559	0	1	0.292	0	0.455
African descendant	8,887,559	0	1	0.038	0	0.191
Other ethnicities	8,887,559	0	1	0.670	1	0.470
Migrants	9,023,732	0	1	0.006	0	0.076
People with disabilities	9,023,732	0	1	0.125	0	0.330
EDUCATION						
Years of schooling	9,023,732	0	18	9.236	11	4.649
At least one year in tertiary	9,023,732	0	1	0.286	0	0.452
Level of education						
No education	9,023,732	0	1	0.246	0	0.431
Primary education	9,023,732	0	1	0.201	0	0.400
Secondary education	9,023,732	0	1	0.338	0	0.473
Post-secondary education	9,023,732	0	1	0.215	0	0.411
LABOR MARKET						
Participation rate	6,737,003	0	1	0.791	1	0.406
Employment rate	7,884,265	0	1	0.648	1	0.478
Unemployment rate	5,331,078	0	1	0.042	0	0.201
Labor income	Missing					
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS						
Type of household						
Nuclear family	4,511,866	0	1	0.147	0	0.354
Household with only children	4,511,866	0	1	0.435	0	0.496
Household without children	4,511,866	0	1	0.144	0	0.351
Household with children and other adults	4,511,866	0	1	0.274	0	0.446
Homeownership	4,511,866	0	1	0.776	1	0.417

Note: unweighted statistics

Table A8: Sample descriptive statistics – Uruguay (2017 census)

Variable	Obs	Min	Max	Mean	Median	SD
DEMOGRAPHICS						
Sex						
Men	1,279,084	0	1	0.500	1	0.500
Women	1,279,084	0	1	0.500	0	0.500
Couples						
Different-sex couple	639,542	0	1	0.998	1	0.045
Male same-sex couple	639,542	0	1	0.001	0	0.036
Female same-sex couple	639,542	0	1	0.001	0	0.028
Age	1,279,084	13	111	47.145	46	15.791
Race and ethnicity						
Indigenous	1,249,359	0	1	0.045	0	0.206
African descendant	1,249,359	0	1	0.076	0	0.265
Other ethnicities	1,249,359	0	1	0.880	1	0.326
Migrants	1,260,124	0	1	0.029	0	0.168
People with disabilities	1,260,061	0	1	0.153	0	0.360
EDUCATION						
Years of schooling	1,260,124	0	28	9.215	9	4.041
At least one year in tertiary	1,278,546	0	1	0.181	0	0.385
Level of education						
No education	1,260,124	0	1	0.106	0	0.308
Primary education	1,260,124	0	1	0.619	1	0.486
Secondary education	1,260,124	0	1	0.166	0	0.372
Post-secondary education	1,260,124	0	1	0.109	0	0.311
LABOR MARKET						
Participation rate	1,054,181	0	1	0.797	1	0.402
Employment rate	1,073,057	0	1	0.752	1	0.432
Unemployment rate	840,684	0	1	0.040	0	0.196
Labor income	Missing					
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS						
Type of household						
Nuclear family	639,542	0	1	0.300	0	0.458
Household with only children	639,542	0	1	0.395	0	0.489
Household without children	639,542	0	1	0.153	0	0.360
Household with children and other adults	639,542	0	1	0.152	0	0.359
Homeownership	630,062	0	1	0.609	1	0.488

Note: unweighted statistics

Table A9: Definition of household head

Country	Year	Definition of household head	Source
Argentina	**2010**	The head is the person recognized as such by other household members.	https://international.ipums.org/international/resources/enum_materials_pdf/enum_instruct_ar2010a.pdf
Brazil	**2010**	The head is the person (man or woman), of at least 10 (ten) years, recognized by residents as responsible for the home.	https://celade.cepal.org/censosinfo/manuales/BR_ManCensista_2010.pdf
Chile	**2017**	The head refers to a person 15 years old or older who is recognized as such by the rest of the family	http://resultados.censo2017.cl/download/Glosario.pdf
Colombia	**2018**	The head is the habitual resident who is recognized by the rest of the family as "head."	https://www.dane.gov.co/files/censo2018/informacion-tecnica/cnpv-2018-glosario.pdf
Guatemala	**2018**	The head is the person whom the rest of the home recognizes as such and who makes decisions in that way. The head can be a woman or man and it the person who holds economic responsibility for the house. The head can also be the oldest person if they are a regular resident of the house.	https://www.censopoblacion.gt/archivos/Glosario.pdf
Mexico	**2020**	The head is the person recognized as such by the regular residents of the dwelling, through which the bond or kinship relationship of each resident is known to this person. If no one is identified as the head of the dwelling, then the head is considered the first person of reference 12 years old or older who is mentioned by the informant.	https://www.inegi.org.mx/app/glosario/default.html?p=cpv2020
Peru	**2017**	The head is the person whom other household members recognize as such and who lives permanently in the dwelling.	https://www.gob.pe/536-consultar-resultados-del-censo-nacional-2017-definiciones-basicas
Uruguay	**2017**	The head is the person recognized as such by other household members.	https://international.ipums.org/international/resources/enum_materials_pdf/enum_instruct_uy2011a.pdf

Table A10: Household relationship to the head categories in the original language

Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Guatemala	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay
2010	2010	2017	2018	2018	2020	2017	2017
Jefe(a)	Pessoa responsável pelo domicílio	Jefe/a de Hogar	Jefe(a) de hogar	Jefa o Jefe del hogar	Jefa o jefe	Jefe o Jefa del hogar	Jefe/a o persona de referencia
Cónyuge o pareja	Cônjuge ou companheiro(a) de sexo diferente	Esposo/a o cónyuge	Pareja (cónyuge, compañero[a], esposo[a])	Esposa(o) o pareja	Esposa(o) o pareja	Esposo/a o compañero/a	Esposo/a o compañero/a
Hijo(a) / Hijastro(a)	Cônjuge ou companheiro(a) do mesmo sexo	Conviviente por unión civil	Hijo(a)	Hija o hijo	Hija(o)	Hijo(a) / hijastro(a)	Hijo/a de ambos
Yerno / Nuera	Filho(a) do responsável e do cônjuge	Conviviente de hecho o pareja	Hijastro(a)	Hijastra(o)	Nieta(o)	Yerno / nuera	Hijo/a sólo del jefe/a
Nieto(a)	Filho(a) somente do responsável	Hijo/a	Yerno o nuera	Nuera o yerno	Nuera o yerno	Nieto/a	Hijo/a del esposo/a o compañero/a
Padre / Madre / Suegro(a)	Enteado(a)	Hijo/a del cónyuge, conviviente o pareja.	Padre o madre	Nieta o nieto	Madre o padre	Padre / madre / suegro/a	Yerno/nuera
Otros familiares	Genro ou nora	Hermano/a	Padrastro o madrastra	Hermana o hermano	Suegra(o)	Hermano/a	Padre/madre
Otros no familiares	Pai, mãe, padrasto ou madrasta	Padre/Madre	Suegro(a)	Madre o padre	Otro parentesco	Otro/a pariente	Suegro/a
Servicio doméstico y sus familiares	Sogro(a)	Cuñado/a	Hermano(a)	Suegra o suegro	Sin parentesco	Trabajador/a del hogar	Hermano/a
	Neto(a)	Suegro/a	Hermanastro(a)	Cuñada o cuñado		Pensionista	Cuñado/a
	Bisneto(a)	Yerno/Nuera	Cuñado(a)	Otra(o) pariente		Otro/a no pariente	Nieto/a
	Irmão ou irmã	Nieto/	Nieto(a)	Empleada(o) doméstica(o)		Otro pariente	
	Avô ou avó	Abuelo/a	Abuelo(a)	Pensionista o huésped			Otro no pariente
	Outro parente	Otro pariente	Otro pariente	Otra(o) no pariente			Servicio doméstico o familiar del mismo
	Agregado(a)	No pariente	Empleado(a) del servicio doméstico				Miembro de hogar colectivo
	Convivente	Servicio doméstico puertas adentro	No pariente				
	Pensionista						
	Empregado(a) doméstico(a)						
	Parente do(a) empregado(a) doméstico(a)						
	Individual em domicílio coletivo						

Note: Categories used to identify a partner are marked in grey

Table A11: Household relationship to the head categories (categories translated into English)

Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Guatemala	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay
2010	2010	2017	2018	2018	2020	2017	2017
Head	Person responsible for the home	Head of household	Head of household	Head of household	Head of household	Head of household	Head or reference person
Partner or husband	Spouse or partner of different sex	Partner or husband	Partner (spouse, companion, husband)	Partner or husband	Partner or husband	Partner or husband	Partner or husband
Son (daughter) / stepson (stepdaughter)	Spouse or same-sex partner	Cohabitant by civil union	Son (daughter)	Son (daughter)	Son (daughter)	Son (daughter) / stepson (stepdaughter)	Son (daughter) of both
Son (daughter)-in-law	Son of the person responsible and the spouse	De facto cohabitant or partner	Stepson (stepdaughter)	Stepson (stepdaughter)	Grandson (granddaughter)	Son-in-law or daughter-in-law	Son (daughter) of only the household head
Grandson (granddaughter)	Son only of the person responsible	Son (daughter) of both	Son-in-law or daughter-in-law	Son-in-law or daughter-in-law	Son-in-law or daughter-in-law	Grandson (granddaughter)	Son (daughter) of only the household partner or husband
Father / mother / father-in-law	Stepson	Son (daughter) of only the household partner or husband	Father / mother	Grandson (granddaughter)	Father or mother	Father / mother / father-in-law	Son-in-law/ daughter-in-law
Other family	Son-in-law or daughter-in-law	Brother (sister)	Stepfather or Stepmother	Brother or sister	Mother (father)-in-law	Brother (sister)	Father / mother
Other nonrelatives	Father, mother, stepfather, or stepmother	Father / mother	Father-in-law or mother-in-law	Father or mother	Other relatives	Other relatives	Father-in-law or mother-in-law
Domestic servants and their families	Father-in-law	Brother (sister)-in-law	Brother (sister)	Father-in-law or mother-in-law	Nonrelative	Domestic employee	Brother (sister)
	Grandson (granddaughter)	Father-in-law or mother-in-law	Stepbrother (stepsister)	Sister-in-law or brother-in-law		Pensioner	Brother-in-law (sister-in-law)
	Great-grandson	Son-in-law/ daughter-in-law	Brother-in-law (sister-in-law)	Other relatives		Other nonrelatives	Grandson (granddaughter)
	Brother and sister	Grandson (granddaughter)	Grandson (granddaughter)	Domestic employee		Other relatives	
	Grandfather or grandmother	Grandfather (grandmother)	Grandfather (grandmother)	Pensioner or guest			Other nonrelatives
	Other relatives or their familiars	Other relatives	Other relatives	Other nonrelatives			Domestic employees or their familiars
	Relative	Nonrelatives	Domestic service employee				Group household member
	Cohabitant	Indoor domestic servants	Nonrelatives				
	Pensioner						
	Domestic employee						
	Family member of the domestic employee						
	Individual in a collective home						

Note: Categories used to identify a partner are marked in grey

Table A12: Indigenous status in Chile and Mexico

Country	Chile	Mexico
Year	2017	2020
Target population	All people	Those 3 years old and older
Indigenous question	Consider themselves to belong to an Indigenous or native people (yes/no)	According to your culture, [...] do you consider yourself Indigenous? (yes/no)
African descendant question		Because of your ancestors and in accordance with your customs and traditions, [...] are you considered Black Afro-Mexican or an African descendant? (yes/no)

Table A13: Ethnicity question

Country	Brazil	Colombia	Guatemala	Peru	Uruguay
Year	**2010**	**2018**	**2018**	**2017**	**2017**
Target population	All people	All people	All people	Those 12 years old and older	All people
Ethnicity Question	Their color or race is…	According to their culture, people, or physical traits, they are or are recognized as…	Based on your background or history, how do you consider or self-identify:	Because of your customs and ancestors, do you feel or consider:	Do you think you have ancestry…
Indigenous categories	Indigenous	Indigenous	Maya Garífuna Xinka	Quechua Aimara Native or indigenous to the Amazon Belonging to or part of another Indigenous or native people Shawi Ashaninka Awajun Shipibo Konibo	Indigenous
African descendant categories	Brown Black	Raizal of the archipelago of San Andrés, Providencia and Santa Catalina Palenquero de San Basilio Black, mulatto, Afro-descendant, Afro-Colombian	Afro-descendant / Creole / Afromestizo?	Black, moreno, zambo, mulatto / Afro-Peruvian or Afro-descendant people	African or Black?
Not Indigenous or African descendant categories	White Yellow	Gitano o rom No ethnic group	Ladin(s) Foreigner	White Mestizo Other Do not know / no answer Nikkei Tusan	Asian or Yellow White Other

Table A14: Indicators included in the asset index by country

Description	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Guatemala	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay
Material in wall	-	9 categories	6 categories	9 categories	10 categories	8 categories	9 categories	7 categories
Material in ceiling	8 categories	-	7 categories	-	7 categories	10 categories	8 categories	6 categories
Material in floor	3 categories	-	5 categories	6 categories	8 categories	3 categories	7 categories	5 categories
Watter in the house	3 categories	10 categories	7 categories	Yes/No	10 categories	13 categories	8 categories	7 categories
Type of household	8 categories	6 categories	7 categories	6 categories	6 categories	-	9 categories	8 categories
Toilet type	-	-	-	6 categories	5 categories	3 categories	-	-
Kitchen type	-	-	-	6 categories	Yes/No	6 categories	-	3 categories
Source of water for cooking	-	-	-	11 categories	-	-	-	-
With dwelling ownership	5 categories	6 categories	-	-	6 categories	4 categories	5 categories	Yes/No
With a refrigerator in the house	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
With telephone in the house	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
With a cellphone in the house	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
With a computer in the house	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
With internet in the house	-	Yes/No	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
With television in the house	-	Yes/No	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
With a kitchen in the household	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	-
With electricity in the household	-	Yes/No	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	6 categories
With a washing machine in the household	-	Yes/No	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	-
With an oven in the household	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	-
With own car in the household	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
With a motorcycle	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
With a bike	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With a radio	-	Yes/No	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	Yes/No
With cable TV	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	-
With a paid streaming service	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With videogames	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With a tinaco	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With a water tank	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	-
With a water bomb	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With a watering can	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With a water heater	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With a solar water heater	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With air conditioning	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With solar panels	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-
With a stereo	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-
With a blender	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-
With an iron	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-
With a boat	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-
With a stove	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-	-
Use of clean fuel in the household	5 categories	-	-	-	7 categories	5 categories	8 categories	7 categories
With sewerage	-	Yes/No	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	5 categories	8 categories	4 categories
With gas	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-	-	-
With trash	-	7 categories	-	Yes/No	8 categories	6 categories	-	-
With a temazcal	-	-	-	-	Yes/No	-	-	-
With a water heater	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No
With a dryer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No
With an XO laptop	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes/No
With an exclusive bathroom for the household	3 categories	-	-	-	Yes/No	Yes/No	-	Yes/No
Number of rooms	0-10	1-9	1-6	1-20	1-18	1-25	1-15	1-20
Ownership of the land	Yes/No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
With a bathroom	Yes/No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
With an improved bathroom	Yes/No	-	-	-	-	3 categories	-	-
With a heating system	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 categories

Appendix B. Additional figures and tables.

Figure B1: Data coverage

Note: The areas in gray indicate the countries included in the main analysis. Source: authors' own calculations.

Figure B2: Attitudes towards same-sex marriage



Note: Original question was "How strongly do you approve or disapprove of same-sex couples having the right to marry?" (scale 0-100). Source: authors' own calculation based on data from AmericasBarometer 2010-2018 (https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/lapop.central/viz/LAPOPV3_2/Combination?publish=yes, accessed in November 2023).

Figure B3: Attitudes towards sexual minority individuals as politicians



Note: Original question was "And now, changing the topic and thinking of homosexuality, how strongly do you approve or disapprove of such people being permitted to run for public office?" (scale 0-100). Source: authors' own calculation based on data from AmericasBarometer 2010-2018 (https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/lapop.central/viz/LAPOPV3_2/Combination?publish=yes, accessed in November 2023)

Figure B4: Disability rates among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Respondents with disabilities are individuals who report having at least some difficulty doing certain activities (vision, hearing, mobility, cognition, self-care, and communication). Only questions that are close to the Washington Group Short Set on Functioning are used. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. Information about disability is not available in Argentina, Chile, or Colombia.

Figure B5: Average years of education of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Years of education are defined as completed years of formal schooling and are derived from the information about the last completed grade and the duration of each level in each country's educational system. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. Information about years of education is not available in Brazil or Colombia.

Figure B6: Population with less than primary education in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Respondents with less than primary education are individuals with no formal education or with incomplete primary education. Primary education is not defined to match any official country's educational definition, and when possible, the first six years of formal education are considered as primary (following the harmonization by IPUMS-International). The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics.

Figure B7: Population with only primary education in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Respondents with primary education are individuals who completed primary education but who have less than secondary education. The levels of education are not defined to match any official country's educational definition, and when possible, the first six years of formal education are considered as primary education, and the first twelve years of formal education are considered as secondary education (following the harmonization by IPUMS-International). The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics.

Figure B8: Population with only secondary education in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Respondents with secondary education are individuals who completed secondary education but who have less than tertiary education. The levels of education are not defined to match any official country's educational definition, and when possible, the first twelve years of formal education are considered as secondary education (following the harmonization by IPUMS-International). The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics.

Figure B9: Population with tertiary education in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Respondents with tertiary education are individuals who completed a post-secondary degree. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics.

Figure B10: Educational level of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples, with demographic controls



Note: This graph plots gaps related to different-sex couples, controlling for age and ethnicity. These estimates are derived from a linear regression model at the individual level, where the dependent variable is the likelihood of having completed at least one year of post-secondary education. The regressions are weighted and run separately by sex and country. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old.

Figure B11: Childrearing by couple type, with demographic and education controls



Note: This graph plots gaps relative to different-sex couples, controlling for age, ethnicity and education of both household head and their partner. These estimates are derived from a linear regression model at the household level, where the dependent variable is the presence of children. The regressions are weighted and run separately by country. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old.

Figure B12: Share of couples with children but no other adults by couple type



Note: Couples in households with children but no other adults are defined as households headed by a couple who cohabit only with other individuals younger than 18 years. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics.

Figure B13: Share of couples with children and other adults by couple type



Note: Couples in households with children and other adults are defined as households headed by a couple who cohabit with at least one individual younger than 18 years and at least one individual older than 17 years. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics.

Figure B14: Share of couples in nuclear families by type of couple



Note: Nuclear families are defined as households headed by a couple who do not cohabit with any other individual. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics.

Figure B15: Labor force participation rate of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: Labor force participation is defined as the share of individuals who are part of the labor force, either working (working for pay at a job/business; working without pay at a job/business; with a job but not at work) or seeking work (unemployed) during the reference period. The sample is restricted to individuals aged 18 to 64 years. Weighted statistics.

Figure B16: Employment rate of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples



Note: The employment rate is defined as the share of individuals who are working (working for pay at a job/business; working without pay at a job/business; with a job but not at work) during the reference period. The sample is restricted to individuals aged 18 to 64 years. Weighted statistics.

Figure B17: Probability of both partners working by type of couple



Note: The probability is equal to 1 if both members of the couple are employed and 0 otherwise (if at least one member is out of the labor force or unemployed) during the reference period. The sample is restricted to couples with at least one individual aged 18 to 64 years. Weighted statistics.

Figure B18: Unemployment rates among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples, with demographic and education controls



Note: This graph plots gaps relative to different-sex couples, controlling for age, ethnicity and education at individual level. These estimates are derived from a linear regression model at the household level, where the dependent variable is a binary indicator of unemployment. The regressions are weighted and run separately by sex and country. The sample is restricted to individuals aged 18 to 64 years.

Figure B19: Individual income distribution by couple type in Brazil

Panel A: Women



Panel B: Men



Note: Income is defined as the (natural logarithm of) total gross monthly individual income received in July 2010. The sample includes individuals aged 18 to 64 years who were working and declared positive income. Weighted statistics.

Figure B20: Individual income distribution by couple type in Mexico

Panel A: Women



Panel B: Men



Note: Income is defined as the (natural logarithm of) monthly labor earnings received in March 2020. The sample includes individuals aged 18 to 64 years who were working and declared positive income. Weighted statistics.

Figure B21: Homeownership rates by couple type, with demographics and education controls



Note: This graph plots gaps relative to different-sex couples, controlling for the age, ethnicity and education of both partners in the household. These estimates are derived from a linear regression model at the household level, where the dependent variable is a binary indicator of homeownership. The regressions are weighted and run separately by country. Both Chile and Colombia are excluded due to the unavailability of data on homeownership in these countries. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old.

Figure B22: Homeownership rates by couple type, with demographics, education and location controls



Note: This graph plots gaps relative to different-sex couples, controlling for the age, ethnicity, and education of both partners in the household, as well as the location at the first administrative level. These estimates are derived from a linear regression model at the household level, where the dependent variable is a binary indicator of homeownership. The regression is weighted. Both Chile and Colombia are excluded due to the unavailability of data on homeownership in these countries. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old.

Figure B23: Histogram of the asset index



Note: The asset index is constructed as a weighted average of a set indicators reflecting ownership of assets, access to certain services, and dwelling characteristics (see Table A14) via principal component analysis. The sample is restricted to couples with both individuals aged between 18 and 64 years. Unweighted statistics.

Figure B24: Histogram of the asset index after partialling out demographics



Note: The histogram plots the residuals of a regression of an asset index on the household head's age (and its square), race/ethnicity, region, and educational attainment, as well as the characteristics of the partner (age, race/ethnicity, and education). The asset index is constructed as a weighted average of a set of indicators reflecting ownership of assets, access to certain services, and dwelling characteristics (see Table A14) via principal component analysis. The sample is restricted to couples with both individuals aged between 18 and 64 years. Unweighted statistics.

Table B1: Average age of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples

	Women in different-sex couples	Women in same-sex couples	Men in different-sex couples	Men in same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)-(1)	(4)-(3)
Argentina	44.20	45.06	47.20	41.01	0.86	-6.19
	{0.018}	{0.350}	{0.018}	{0.375}	(0.014)	(0.000)
Brazil	41.44	34.24	45.07	35.50	-7.21	-9.56
	{0.008}	{0.144}	{0.008}	{0.174}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Chile	46.99	35.18	49.54	36.13	-11.81	-13.41
	{0.008}	{0.100}	{0.009}	{0.087}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Colombia	43.27	39.88	47.16	39.04	-3.39	-8.12
	{0.005}	{0.069}	{0.006}	{0.071}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Guatemala	40.67	38.17	44.07	38.05	-2.50	-6.02
	{0.009}	{0.685}	{0.010}	{0.555}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mexico	44.34	43.88	47.84	45.24	-0.46	-2.60
	{0.009}	{0.107}	{0.009}	{0.071}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Peru	43.78	42.80	47.26	41.44	-0.98	-5.82
	{0.007}	{0.178}	{0.007}	{0.209}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Uruguay	45.51	35.90	48.82	37.96	-9.61	-10.87
	{0.019}	{0.331}	{0.020}	{0.293}	(0.000)	(0.000)

Note: Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. See also Figure 1.

Table B2: Indigenous rates among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples

	Women in different-sex couples	Women in same-sex couples	Men in different-sex couples	Men in same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type (p.p.)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)-(1)	(4)-(3)
Brazil	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.01	-0.06
	{0.0000}	{0.0009}	{0.0000}	{0.0009}	(0.953)	(0.464)
Chile	11.8%	12.0%	11.7%	10.0%	0.18	-1.61
	{0.0002}	{0.0028}	{0.0002}	{0.0024}	(0.526)	(0.000)
Colombia	3.9%	2.9%	3.8%	2.4%	-1.06	-1.43
	{0.0001}	{0.0007}	{0.0001}	{0.0008}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Guatemala	41.7%	30.3%	42.2%	30.1%	-11.42	-12.07
	{0.0003}	{0.0197}	{0.0003}	{0.0168}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mexico	38.7%	31.3%	39.1%	35.4%	-7.40	-3.72
	{0.0003}	{0.0030}	{0.0003}	{0.0022}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Peru	28.9%	20.3%	29.5%	20.8%	-8.62	-8.73
	{0.0002}	{0.0046}	{0.0002}	{0.0055}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Uruguay	5.7%	11.5%	4.9%	8.6%	5.83	3.68
	{0.0003}	{0.0102}	{0.0003}	{0.0069}	(0.000)	(0.000)

Note: Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. The comparisons by couple type are expressed in percentage points (p.p.). Information about ethnicity is not available for Argentina. See also Figure 2.

Table B3: Share of people who speak an Indigenous language by couple type

	Female different sex couples	Female same-sex couples	Males in Different sex couples	Male same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)-(1)	(4)-(3)
Guatemala	30.92%	20.85%	31.34%	19.09%	-10.07%	-12.26%
	{0.00}	{0.02}	{0.00}	{0.01}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Mexico	21.19%	16.69%	22.03%	19.99%	-4.49%	-2.04%
	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Peru	22.09%	12.66%	22.37%	13.40%	-9.43%	-8.97%
	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	(0.00)	(0.00)

Note: Weighted statistics The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses.

Table B4: African descendant rates among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples

	Women in different-sex couples	Women in same-sex couples	Men in different-sex couples	Men in same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type (p.p.)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)-(1)	(4)-(3)
Brazil	48.1%	44.4%	49.3%	39.9%	-3.69	-9.46
	{0.0003}	{0.0074}	{0.0003}	{0.0081}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Colombia	6.1%	8.3%	6.4%	7.2%	2.19	0.86
	{0.0001}	{0.0012}	{0.0001}	{0.0013}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Guatemala	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.02	-0.05
	{0.0000}	{0.0018}	{0.0000}	{0.0013}	(0.912)	(0.694)
Mexico	2.6%	2.9%	2.7%	2.7%	0.31	-0.03
	{0.0001}	{0.0011}	{0.0001}	{0.0007}	(0.004)	(0.649)
Peru	3.3%	5.1%	4.2%	5.5%	1.74	1.29
	{0.0001}	{0.0025}	{0.0001}	{0.0031}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Uruguay	7.6%	11.2%	7.6%	10.7%	3.56	3.11
	{0.0003}	{0.0100}	{0.0003}	{0.0076}	(0.000)	(0.000)

Note: Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. The comparisons by couple type are expressed in percentage points (p.p.). Information about race is not available for Argentina or Chile. See also Figure 3.

Table B5: Share of migrants by continent and couple type

Country	Couple type	N	Continent of Origin (%)				
			Latin America	North America	Asia	Europe	Rest
Argentina	Same-sex	339	80.8	2.1	1.2	15.0	0.9
	Different-sex	91,574	81.5	0.5	1.7	16.0	0.3
Brazil	Same-sex	56	32.5	8.5	3.9	37.8	17.2
	Different-sex	23,639	30.0	2.2	15.9	48.0	4.0
Chile	Same-sex	3,316	90.4	2.3	0.6	6.0	0.8
	Different-sex	297,355	88.0	1.5	2.9	6.7	0.8
Guatemala	Same-sex	32	53.1	25.0	0.0	9.4	12.5
	Different-sex	36,226	84.4	5.9	2.7	3.3	3.6
Mexico	Same-sex	439	50.8	38.0	0.7	9.3	1.1
	Different-sex	18,700	49.0	40.3	2.5	7.5	0.7
Peru	Same-sex	395	69.6	7.3	7.6	14.9	0.5
	Different-sex	52,009	72.9	4.5	6.9	14.7	1.0
Uruguay	Same-sex	118	79.7	1.7	0.8	16.1	1.7
	Different-sex	36,323	63.9	1.8	1.5	32.0	0.8

Note: Weighted statistics on the percentage by continent. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old.

Table B6: Educational level of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples

	Women in different-sex couples	Women in same-sex couples	Men in different-sex couples	Men in same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type (p.p.)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)-(1)	(4)-(3)
Argentina	24.9%	28.2%	19.5%	39.8%	3.27	20.27
	{0.0005}	{0.0085}	{0.0005}	{0.0110}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Brazil	14.7%	31.3%	12.8%	44.9%	16.54	32.08
	{0.0002}	{0.0071}	{0.0002}	{0.0083}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Chile	27.8%	52.1%	28.3%	65.3%	24.29	37.01
	{0.0003}	{0.0042}	{0.0003}	{0.0038}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Colombia	25.9%	35.6%	22.3%	45.7%	9.77	23.31
	{0.0002}	{0.0021}	{0.0002}	{0.0025}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Guatemala	5.4%	15.3%	7.1%	15.3%	9.93	8.25
	{0.0001}	{0.0155}	{0.0002}	{0.0132}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mexico	9.0%	14.7%	10.3%	11.9%	5.75	1.56
	{0.0002}	{0.0023}	{0.0002}	{0.0015}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Peru	27.2%	32.3%	30.0%	38.0%	5.11	8.02
	{0.0002}	{0.0052}	{0.0002}	{0.0065}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Uruguay	21.0%	43.0%	15.1%	42.4%	22.02	27.31
	{0.0005}	{0.0158}	{0.0004}	{0.0122}	(0.000)	(0.000)

Note: Percentage of individuals with at least one year of post-secondary education. Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. The comparisons by couple type are expressed in percentage points (p.p.). See also Figure 5.

Table B7: Educational levels of individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples – Detailed categories

	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Guatemala	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Less than primary education								
Women in different-sex couples	13.8%	36.5%	10.4%	4.4%	54.8%	26.5%	28.0%	9.1%
Women in same-sex couples	17.8%	13.2%	3.7%	4.4%	35.4%	22.9%	26.2%	2.4%
Men in different-sex couples	15.5%	41.7%	10.0%	5.6%	47.0%	27.5%	21.3%	12.2%
Men in same-sex couples	12.2%	11.3%	2.3%	4.2%	34.5%	25.1%	19.4%	4.4%
Primary education								
Women in different-sex couples	49.6%	26.9%	29.5%	26.8%	31.4%	51.4%	21.2%	60.4%
Women in same-sex couples	42.5%	26.8%	13.8%	18.4%	36.3%	46.3%	18.5%	44.6%
Men in different-sex couples	52.7%	25.9%	30.8%	32.0%	37.2%	49.9%	18.9%	63.5%
Men in same-sex couples	36.5%	17.4%	8.3%	14.1%	39.4%	49.1%	15.2%	42.2%
Secondary education								
Women in different-sex couples	17.0%	25.7%	36.5%	42.9%	10.0%	12.5%	30.9%	17.5%
Women in same-sex couples	20.2%	39.1%	42.8%	41.6%	16.1%	15.8%	32.2%	34.1%
Men in different-sex couples	17.7%	23.1%	35.4%	40.1%	10.6%	12.0%	36.7%	15.6%
Men in same-sex couples	24.2%	39.9%	38.1%	36.0%	14.2%	13.5%	37.4%	34.0%
Tertiary education								
Women in different-sex couples	19.6%	10.9%	23.6%	25.9%	3.7%	9.6%	19.9%	13.1%
Women in same-sex couples	19.5%	20.9%	39.7%	35.6%	12.2%	15.0%	23.1%	18.9%
Men in different-sex couples	14.1%	9.2%	23.8%	22.3%	5.2%	10.6%	23.1%	8.7%
Men in same-sex couples	27.1%	31.4%	51.2%	45.7%	11.8%	12.2%	28.0%	19.4%

Note: Weighted statistics. The sample includes individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. See also Figures B6-B9.

Table B8: Childrearing by couple type

	Different-sex couples	Female same-sex couples	Male same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type (p.p.)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)-(1)	(3)-(1)
Argentina	61.9%	28.7%	2.8%	-33.2	-59.0
	{0.001}	{0.012}	{0.005}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Brazil	78.0%	38.4%	15.8%	-39.6	-62.2
	{0.000}	{0.010}	{0.008}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Chile	57.4%	28.7%	7.5%	-28.7	-49.9
	{0.000}	{0.005}	{0.003}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Colombia	66.3%	55.4%	38.4%	-10.9	-28.0
	{0.000}	{0.003}	{0.003}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Guatemala	80.6%	29.5%	35.8%	-51.1	-44.9
	{0.000}	{0.028}	{0.025}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mexico	69.7%	61.4%	65.5%	-8.3	-4.2
	{0.000}	{0.004}	{0.003}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Peru	70.9%	54.1%	36.9%	-16.8	-34.0
	{0.000}	{0.008}	{0.009}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Uruguay	54.8%	19.7%	3.7%	-35.1	-51.2
	{0.001}	{0.018}	{0.007}	(0.000)	(0.000)

Note: Children are any individuals younger than 18 years old cohabiting with the main couple (i.e., the head of household and their spouse or partner). Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. The comparisons by couple type are expressed in percentage points (p.p.). See also Figure 6.

Table B9: Unemployment rates among individuals in same-sex and different-sex couples

	Women in different-sex couples	Women in same-sex couples	Men in different-sex couples	Men in same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type (p.p.)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)-(1)	(4)-(3)
Argentina	6.9%	4.8%	2.1%	3.3%	-2.03	1.18
	{0.0004}	{0.0049}	{0.0002}	{0.0045}	(0.000)	(0.008)
Brazil	12.8%	9.0%	6.6%	5.4%	-3.83	-1.18
	{0.0003}	{0.0045}	{0.0001}	{0.0039}	(0.000)	(0.002)
Chile	4.4%	7.3%	4.5%	5.1%	2.84	0.60
	{0.0002}	{0.0024}	{0.0001}	{0.0018}	(0.000)	(0.001)
Colombia	7.4%	9.6%	6.3%	8.8%	2.18	2.49
	{0.0002}	{0.0016}	{0.0001}	{0.0016}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Guatemala	0.6%	2.6%	1.6%	2.3%	1.95	0.65
	{0.0001}	{0.0084}	{0.0001}	{0.0068}	(0.021)	(0.342)
Mexico	0.6%	2.6%	3.6%	3.2%	2.02	-0.35
	{0.0001}	{0.0014}	{0.0001}	{0.0011}	(0.000)	(0.001)
Peru	7.1%	6.1%	2.7%	4.7%	-1.02	2.02
	{0.0002}	{0.0034}	{0.0001}	{0.0033}	(0.003)	(0.000)
Uruguay	7.0%	5.5%	1.7%	4.1%	-1.47	2.38
	{0.0004}	{0.0075}	{0.0002}	{0.0052}	(0.051)	(0.000)

Note: Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses. The sample is restricted to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years. Weighted statistics. The comparisons by couple type are expressed in percentage points (p.p.). See also Figure 7.

Table B10: Individual income gaps by couple type, including all coefficients

	Brazil				Mexico	
	Income		Earnings		Earnings	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Same sex	0.198***	0.102***	0.186***	0.085***	0.288***	-0.106***
	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.009)	(0.006)
Age	0.022***	0.028***	0.041***	0.047***	0.044***	0.026***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Age^2	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Primary	0.192***	0.247***	0.221***	0.247***	0.233***	0.149***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)
Secondary	0.444***	0.504***	0.487***	0.499***	0.531***	0.311***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.002)
Tertiary	1.128***	1.235***	1.156***	1.217***	1.037***	0.647***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)
Indigenous people	-0.120***	-0.195***	-0.157***	-0.202***	-0.161***	-0.113***
	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.004)	(0.002)
African descendant	-0.096***	-0.102***	-0.101***	-0.098***	-0.043***	-0.028***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.006)	(0.004)
Children	-0.032***	0.031***	-0.044***	0.035***	-0.084***	-0.003
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Age (partner)	0.000	0.001***	0.001***	0.000*	-0.002***	-0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Primary (partner)	0.139***	0.196***	0.162***	0.198***	0.179***	0.160***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)
Secondary (partner)	0.277***	0.353***	0.306***	0.355***	0.318***	0.277***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)
Tertiary (partner)	0.625***	0.641***	0.637***	0.638***	0.430***	0.395***
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.003)
Indigenous people (partner)	-0.110***	-0.180***	-0.131***	-0.178***	0.090	0.001
	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.071)	(0.055)
African descendant (partner)	-0.064***	-0.113***	-0.064***	-0.109***	-0.101***	-0.123***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)
Constant	5.527***	5.713***	5.135***	5.383***	6.995***	7.980***
	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.019)	(0.010)
Observations	1,828,224	2,919,186	1,789,642	2,912,198	663,301	1,719,783
R-squared	0.413	0.443	0.425	0.446	0.295	0.236
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mean log of income	6.655	6.990	6.588	6.935	8.259	8.596

Note: Weighted statistics. Robust standard errors clustered at the couple level are in parentheses. The dependent variable is the logarithm of income or earnings. The sample is restricted to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years who were working and reported income greater than zero. The regressions include state fixed effects. See also Table 2.

Table B11: Individual income gaps by couple type, including all coefficients and with different samples

	Brazil					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Same sex	0.2597***	0.3686***	1.1912***	0.1272***	0.0583	-0.0260
	(0.0221)	(0.0407)	(0.0575)	(0.0269)	(0.0443)	(0.0609)
Age	-0.0073***	0.0971***	0.3155***	0.0082***	0.0617***	0.3195***
	(0.0014)	(0.0024)	(0.0023)	(0.0007)	(0.0014)	(0.0020)
Age^2	0.0002***	-0.0009***	-0.0038***	0.0001***	-0.0006***	-0.0039***
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Primary	0.2450***	0.5204***	0.5667***	0.2901***	0.4689***	0.5125***
	(0.0034)	(0.0059)	(0.0061)	(0.0017)	(0.0033)	(0.0049)
Secondary	0.5577***	0.9687***	1.4372***	0.5694***	0.8003***	0.8971***
	(0.0035)	(0.0063)	(0.0072)	(0.0020)	(0.0037)	(0.0056)
Tertiary	1.3299***	1.9920***	3.4959***	1.3031***	1.5869***	1.8008***
	(0.0042)	(0.0071)	(0.0096)	(0.0031)	(0.0051)	(0.0083)
Indigenous people	-0.1299***	-0.6701***	-0.2934***	-0.2720***	-0.7301***	-0.8626***
	(0.0275)	(0.0493)	(0.0487)	(0.0171)	(0.0323)	(0.0416)
African descendant	-0.0735***	-0.1739***	-0.0724***	-0.1093***	-0.1285***	-0.1474***
	(0.0027)	(0.0048)	(0.0053)	(0.0015)	(0.0029)	(0.0041)
Children	-0.0236***	-0.0305***	-0.2210***	0.0423***	0.0805***	0.2193***
	(0.0031)	(0.0053)	(0.0060)	(0.0018)	(0.0034)	(0.0051)
Age (partner)	-0.0036***	-0.0050***	-0.0228***	0.0003***	-0.0017***	-0.0162***
	(0.0002)	(0.0003)	(0.0003)	(0.0001)	(0.0002)	(0.0003)
Primary (partner)	0.1537***	0.3365***	0.2468***	0.2304***	0.3790***	0.4258***
	(0.0030)	(0.0055)	(0.0061)	(0.0018)	(0.0035)	(0.0050)
Secondary (partner)	0.2965***	0.4940***	0.2136***	0.3917***	0.5854***	0.7056***
	(0.0034)	(0.0062)	(0.0074)	(0.0020)	(0.0038)	(0.0056)
Tertiary (partner)	0.6234***	0.7863***	0.0370***	0.6675***	0.8560***	1.0175***
	(0.0050)	(0.0083)	(0.0111)	(0.0029)	(0.0050)	(0.0077)
Indigenous people (partner)	-0.1166***	-0.4672***	-0.2217***	-0.2646***	-0.6633***	-0.7511***
	(0.0253)	(0.0474)	(0.0482)	(0.0172)	(0.0313)	(0.0402)
African descendant (partner)	-0.0417***	-0.0529***	0.0304***	-0.1215***	-0.1478***	-0.1482***
	(0.0027)	(0.0048)	(0.0053)	(0.0015)	(0.0029)	(0.0042)
Constant	5.9970***	2.6176***	-2.5836***	6.0743***	4.4301***	-0.5974***
	(0.0327)	(0.0559)	(0.0559)	(0.0172)	(0.0330)	(0.0458)
Observations	1,447,549	1,661,693	2,878,578	2,412,045	2,606,524	3,008,534
R-squared	0.2477	0.1778	0.1804	0.3754	0.2307	0.1948
Sex	Female	Female	Female	Male	Male	Male
Sample	Employed	Labor force	All	Employed	Labor force	All
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mean log of income	6.572	5.850	3.440	7.009	6.595	5.749

Note: Weighted statistics. Robust standard errors clustered at the couple level are in parentheses. The dependent variable is the logarithm of income plus one. The sample is restricted to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years. The regressions include state fixed effects.

Table B12: Earning gaps by couple type, including all coefficients and with different samples

	Brazil					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Same sex	0.2624***	0.3709***	1.1859***	0.1000***	0.0335	-0.0485
	(0.0221)	(0.0405)	(0.0570)	(0.0255)	(0.0431)	(0.0599)
Age	0.0749***	0.1630***	0.3293***	0.0552***	0.1031***	0.3422***
	(0.0017)	(0.0025)	(0.0023)	(0.0008)	(0.0014)	(0.0020)
Age^2	-0.0008***	-0.0017***	-0.0040***	-0.0005***	-0.0011***	-0.0041***
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Primary	0.3727***	0.6091***	0.5943***	0.2933***	0.4687***	0.5112***
	(0.0039)	(0.0060)	(0.0060)	(0.0017)	(0.0033)	(0.0048)
Secondary	0.7303***	1.0925***	1.4751***	0.5688***	0.7960***	0.8917***
	(0.0039)	(0.0064)	(0.0071)	(0.0020)	(0.0037)	(0.0055)
Tertiary	1.4944***	2.1054***	3.5094***	1.2935***	1.5723***	1.7811***
	(0.0046)	(0.0072)	(0.0095)	(0.0032)	(0.0051)	(0.0082)
Indigenous people	-0.2371***	-0.7125***	-0.3251***	-0.2993***	-0.7465***	-0.8746***
	(0.0323)	(0.0497)	(0.0479)	(0.0183)	(0.0324)	(0.0411)
African descendant	-0.0794***	-0.1758***	-0.0736***	-0.1051***	-0.1241***	-0.1427***
	(0.0030)	(0.0049)	(0.0052)	(0.0016)	(0.0029)	(0.0041)
Children	-0.0525***	-0.0551***	-0.2302***	0.0492***	0.0861***	0.2207***
	(0.0034)	(0.0054)	(0.0059)	(0.0019)	(0.0034)	(0.0051)
Age (partner)	-0.0039***	-0.0052***	-0.0221***	-0.0004***	-0.0023***	-0.0163***
	(0.0002)	(0.0003)	(0.0003)	(0.0001)	(0.0002)	(0.0003)
Primary (partner)	0.2451***	0.4050***	0.2824***	0.2385***	0.3831***	0.4275***
	(0.0035)	(0.0056)	(0.0060)	(0.0019)	(0.0035)	(0.0050)
Secondary (partner)	0.3916***	0.5681***	0.2585***	0.4012***	0.5907***	0.7075***
	(0.0038)	(0.0063)	(0.0073)	(0.0021)	(0.0038)	(0.0055)
Tertiary (partner)	0.6822***	0.8292***	0.0650***	0.6726***	0.8571***	1.0142***
	(0.0054)	(0.0084)	(0.0110)	(0.0030)	(0.0050)	(0.0076)
Indigenous people (partner)	-0.1970***	-0.4971***	-0.2365***	-0.2659***	-0.6561***	-0.7426***
	(0.0301)	(0.0478)	(0.0473)	(0.0178)	(0.0312)	(0.0398)
African descendant (partner)	-0.0350***	-0.0471***	0.0341***	-0.1154***	-0.1416***	-0.1422***
	(0.0030)	(0.0049)	(0.0052)	(0.0016)	(0.0029)	(0.0041)
Constant	4.0697***	1.0855***	-3.0032***	5.1444***	3.6149***	-1.0496***
	(0.0385)	(0.0568)	(0.0549)	(0.0186)	(0.0331)	(0.0450)
Observations	1,447,549	1,661,693	2,878,578	2,412,045	2,606,524	3,008,534
R-squared	0.2473	0.2007	0.1932	0.3566	0.2330	0.2050
Sex	Female	Female	Female	Male	Male	Male
Sample	Employed	Labor force	All	Employed	Labor force	All
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mean log of earnings	6.400	5.696	3.350	6.932	6.522	5.686

Note: Weighted statistics. Robust standard errors clustered at the couple level are in parentheses. The dependent variable is the logarithm of earnings plus one. The sample is restricted to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years. The regressions include state fixed effects.

Table B13: Individual income gaps by couple type, with occupation control

	Brazil				Mexico	
	Income		Earnings		Earnings	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Same sex	0.181***	0.081***	0.168***	0.064***	0.280***	-0.118***
	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.009)	(0.006)
Observations	1,828,222	2,919,177	1,789,640	2,912,189	657,042	1,699,231
R-squared	0.449	0.493	0.464	0.499	0.374	0.309
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Occupation FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mean log of income	6.655	6.990	6.588	6.935	8.254	8.593

Note: Weighted statistics. Robust standard errors clustered at the couple level are in parentheses. The dependent variable is the natural logarithm of income or earnings. The sample is restricted to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years who were working and reported income greater than zero. The regressions include state and occupation fixed effects as well as household head and partner characteristics (age, educational level indicators, and race/ethnicity indicators). *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table B14: Oaxaca-Blinder-Kitagawa decomposition of individual income gaps by couple type

	Brazil				Mexico	
	Income		Earnings		Earnings	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Different sex	6.654***	6.990***	6.587***	6.934***	8.253***	8.597***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Same sex	7.025***	7.510***	6.959***	7.447***	8.605***	8.574***
	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.007)
Difference	-0.371***	-0.520***	-0.372***	-0.512***	-0.353***	0.023***
	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.007)
Explained	-0.173***	-0.418***	-0.186***	-0.427***	-0.065***	-0.083***
	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.005)	(0.003)
Unexplained	-0.198***	-0.102***	-0.186***	-0.085***	-0.288***	0.106***
	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.008)	(0.006)
Observations	1,828,224	2,919,186	1,789,642	2,912,198	663,027	1,719,193

Note: Weighted statistics. Robust standard errors. The dependent variable is the logarithm of income or earnings. The sample is restricted to individuals aged between 18 and 64 years who were working and reported income greater than zero. The coefficients in the first two rows represent the mean of the logarithm of income or earnings by couple type. Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B15: Homeownership rates by couple type

	Different-sex couples	Female same-sex couples	Male same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type (p.p.)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)-(1)	(3)-(1)
Argentina	73.7%	68.1%	61.9%	-5.5	-11.8
	{0.001}	{0.012}	{0.015}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Brazil	74.8%	51.5%	51.1%	-23.4	-23.8
	{0.000}	{0.010}	{0.012}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Guatemala	81.3%	69.0%	68.5%	-12.3	-12.7
	{0.000}	{0.028}	{0.024}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mexico	78.6%	72.4%	77.1%	-6.2	-1.6
	{0.000}	{0.004}	{0.003}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Peru	77.7%	72.3%	65.1%	-5.4	-12.5
	{0.000}	{0.007}	{0.009}	(0.000)	(0.000)
Uruguay	60.9%	42.8%	46.2%	-18.1	-14.8
	{0.001}	{0.022}	{0.017}	(0.000)	(0.000)

Note: Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses. The sample includes households with couples where at least one member of the couple is over 18 years old. Weighted statistics. The comparisons by couple type are expressed in percentage points (p.p.). See also Figure 8.

Table B16: Share of households in the bottom 20 percent by couple type

	Different-sex couples	Female same-sex couples	Male same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)-(1)	(3)-(1)
Argentina	20.01%	17.60%	17.70%	-2.41	-2.30
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.04)	(0.08)
Brazil	20.01%	16.56%	13.45%	-3.46	-6.57
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Chile	19.83%	40.55%	58.16%	20.72	38.33
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Colombia	20.04%	13.20%	12.34%	-6.84	-7.70
	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Guatemala	20.00%	15.65%	17.23%	-4.35	-2.77
	{0.00}	{0.02}	{0.02}	(0.07)	(0.19)
Mexico	20.02%	14.79%	20.00%	-5.24	-0.03
	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	(0.00)	(0.93)
Peru	20.00%	21.77%	17.58%	1.77	-2.42
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.02)	(0.00)
Uruguay	20.00%	22.22%	35.71%	2.23	15.72
	{0.00}	{0.05}	{0.09}	(0.67)	(0.08)

Note: See Table 3. Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses.

Table B17: Share of households in the bottom 30 percent by couple type

	Different-sex couples	Female same-sex couples	Male same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)-(1)	(3)-(1)
Argentina	30.00%	28.77%	28.33%	-1.23	-1.68
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.02}	(0.37)	(0.29)
Brazil	30.02%	26.59%	21.88%	-3.43	-8.13
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.01)	(0.00)
Chile	29.86%	45.60%	62.17%	15.74	32.31
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Colombia	30.04%	22.85%	25.00%	-7.19	-5.03
	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Guatemala	30.00%	24.35%	23.38%	-5.65	-6.62
	{0.00}	{0.03}	{0.02}	(0.05)	(0.00)
Mexico	30.02%	24.19%	29.95%	-5.83	-0.07
	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	(0.00)	(0.83)
Peru	30.00%	30.01%	24.51%	0.01	-5.50
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.99)	(0.00)
Uruguay	29.99%	41.27%	50.00%	11.28	20.01
	{0.00}	{0.06}	{0.09}	(0.07)	(0.03)

Note: See Table 3. Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses.

Table B18: Share of households in the bottom 50 percent by couple type

	Different-sex couples	Female same-sex couples	Male same-sex couples	Comparisons by couple type	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)-(1)	(3)-(1)
Argentina	50.00%	47.11%	51.04%	-2.89	1.03
	{0.00}	{0.02}	{0.02}	(0.06)	(0.55)
Brazil	50.02%	45.62%	38.70%	-4.40	-11.32
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Chile	49.92%	56.12%	69.53%	6.19	19.60
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Colombia	50.01%	45.18%	51.50%	-4.84	1.49
	{0.00}	{0.00}	{0.00}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Guatemala	50.00%	42.61%	39.08%	-7.39	-10.93
	{0.00}	{0.03}	{0.03}	(0.02)	(0.00)
Mexico	50.02%	46.14%	49.58%	-3.88	-0.44
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.00}	(0.00)	(0.23)
Peru	50.01%	47.13%	42.27%	-2.88	-7.74
	{0.00}	{0.01}	{0.01}	(0.00)	(0.00)
Uruguay	49.99%	61.90%	75.00%	11.91	25.01
	{0.00}	{0.06}	{0.08}	(0.05)	(0.00)

Note: See Table 3. Robust standard errors are reported in curly brackets. P-values for the statistical significance of the differences by couple type are reported in parentheses.