Journal of Race, Ethnicity and Politics, page 1 of 47, 2017.

doi:10.1017/rep.2017.15 2056-6085/17

The Race Project: Researching Race in the Social Sciences Researchers, Measures, and Scope of Studies

John A. Garcia
ICPSR-ISR, University of Michigan

Abstract: While the concept and measurement of race has been a longstanding focus of social science research, capturing its significance requires a broader notion than utilizing only racial group categories. More recently, race has been treated as both a "characteristic" and a set of experiences that affect a multitude of life conditions and outcomes. This discussion and analysis moves away from treating race as only a categorical and static characteristic to a multi-dimensional concept that is dynamic, relational, and represents the intersection of individual, ecological, and structural components. By exploring the data collection of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research and studies that include race as a variable, we were able to trace how race has been used by social scientists over the past 60 years. Using an extensive coding protocol, we have attained key characteristics of the principal investigator(s) (PI), funders, scope of the overall study, and the use of different measures of race. As a result, this "meta-analysis" of social science surveys enabled this researcher to examine how these studies use a wide scope of racial "variables," and the way in which PI characteristics affected the inclusion of race-related items. In addition, bivariate analysis is presented to examine social scientists' tendencies in investigating race and inclusion of qualitative examples of item wordings and response categories. This overview of social science studies is placed in the context of conceptual and measurement issues surrounding the use and meaning of race. Hopefully this can serve to advance the discussion and strategic approaches in doing research about race and what should be incorporated in studying race as a lived experience.

Keywords: race, racism, discrimination, institutional racism, phenotype, multiracial, racialization.

Address correspondence and reprint requests to: John A. Garcia, ICPSR-ISR, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. E-mail: johngarc@umich.edu

RACE AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

In light of a series of recent incidences involving communities of color, especially the African American community, phrases such as "lives matter," race matters," "social justice" and the like accent the continued significance of race in the United States. Its significance affects everyday life experiences, social status, opportunity structures and outcomes, power and influence, health status and many other aspects of social and political life (Jones, LaVeist, and Lillie-Blanton 1991; Omni and Winant 1994; Williams 1997). Social science scholars, having explored the social construction of race through both a macro perspective as well as through individual viewpoints and experiences, show how politics and power relations shape the racial order at all levels of society (Bonilla-Silva 1999; James 2001). In addition, political states can have interests in how the deployments of racial categories are accompanied by their associated hierarchies to serve the state's interests (Delgado and Harris 2013). In more authoritarian states, dominant groups tend to maintain and police racial boundaries through social closures and use of force. Concepts of outsiders and insiders, otherness, phenotypes, racism, discrimination, ideology are associated with the notion of race and the use of different categorical distinctions (Arrighi 2007; Cerulo 1997).

This paper represents a "meta- analysis" of social science empirically driven studies and examines how, in these studies, race is represented (i.e. conceptually, categorically, and dimensionally). This research also analyzes the characteristics of the principal investigator(s) (PI) and the period in which the studies were conducted. The central questions that will be explored are as follows: What is the manner in which race has been measured over time (1950–2012)? What has been the scope of race elements that extend beyond the categorization of specified racial groupings? That is, beside "what race are you," were the other items that attempt to capture the meaning and context of racial status in a person's "everyday" life experiences? Do personal characteristics of the PIs (i.e. race/ethnicity, gender, discipline, etc.) affect the nature and scope of dealing with race? Has a broader set of race-related properties increased over time in which surveys have been conducted? To reiterate, the way race has been measured including (or as well as) the breadth or scope of race-related measures is the central foci of this "meta-analysis."

EXPLORING "RACE" IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: AN INTRODUCTION

Much of the current social science literature dealing with race treats it as a social construction involving self-identification (allegiances and identities) and a perception of racial "belonging" by self and others. It also acknowledges that social structures and policies, which categorize racial groups with delineable "traits" (i.e. one drop rule, quantum blood, etc., Ford and Kelly 2005; Garcia 2013; Hirschman, Alba, and Farley 2000; Snipp 2003; Williams, Lavizzo-Mourey, and Warren 1994) does shape the meaning and use of race. For the most part, race has been viewed as an immutable, constant, and "steady state" of being so that one's social status, common experiences, social interactions patterns, etc. are strong predictors of a variety of outcomes (Laveist 1994; Anderson 2006). These outcomes have included socio-economic status, income levels, attitudes (i.e. efficacy, trust, in-out group demarcations), health status and access, political representation, well-being and stress, incarceration and many other domains (Saperstein 2012; Johnson 2011). At the same time, the categorization of racial groups is associated with social stratification, power, prejudice, discrimination, and inequities. In essence, the categorical variable of race (represented by specific racial groupings) and individuals' placement of themselves into these categories incorporates a multitude of meanings, nuances, and relationships (Cobas, Duany, and Feagin 2009; Hans and Martinez 1994; Krysan and Lewis 2004).

An earlier work by Williams (1994) reviewed the concept of race in the journal Health Sciences Research. He examined ways in which race had been conceptualized and used in the health services research literature from 1966 to 1990. He limited the inclusion of articles to empirical research in which human populations were the focus. A major conclusion of this analysis was that "race is routinely used in health...Race needs more careful attention to its conceptualization and measurement..." (Williams 1994, 268). He goes on to state that using race as an "afterthought" or in an automatic and atheoretical manner, or both, "avoids informing others how racial differences are built within societal institutions and can perpetuate the distortion of racial realities" (Williams 1994, 268). As I had noted earlier, a "race variable" serves as an unrefined indicator of a variety of distinguishing groups' histories and particular conditions of "everyday" life that bear on social status and opportunity structures. In any discussion of race as a concept, Williams' examination of research design of empirical studies indicated a major overlap between

race and socio-economic status. At times, these concepts are used interchangeably, yet they are not interchangeable and are not surrogates.

The scope and inclusivity of measures that capture the fuller impact and meaning of race have been relatively absent in most social science empirical research (López and Gomez 2013). Our discussion will begin with the conceptualization of race by introducing the following eight components: first, race is a social construct based on social and political context rather than any essential biological difference between groups (Garcia 2013; Sanchez and Ybarra 2013); second, individuals have considerable agency in placing themselves within racial categories (for example, racial identity); third, racial self-identification is a cognitive dimension of one's self-concept and is a developmental process fourth, the individual does not "choose" racial identity or group membership in isolation and, in fact, is heavily influenced by a host of externalities (Vargas et al. 2016) including social interactions, historical context and patterns, legal status and constraints, and other factors (Bruch and Loveman 2011; Jones et al. 2008; Owens, Robinson, and Smith-Lovin 2010); fifth, race is dynamic, meaning that the understanding and/or expression of one's race can change over time (Saperstein 2012; Saperstein and Penner 2012); sixth, race is an element of multiple social identities in which the "constellation" of self includes race among other salient social identities (Bratter and Gorman 2011; Harris and Sim 2002; Woo et al. 2011; Frank, Redstone, and Lu 2010); seventh, physical features (phenotypical characteristics) (Telles and Murguia 1990). serve as a basis for racial classification, both by the individual and particularly in terms of how others identify her or him (Hochschild 2011) and finally; that there is a "separate but related" notion of race and ethnicity (Garcia 2009; Saperstein 2013; Saperstein and Penner 2012), which can serve as inter-sectional concepts or perhaps inter-changeable concepts (Garcia 2013).

Williams concluded that while health researchers have been paying more attention to the conceptualization and measurement of race (Cooper and David 1986; Jones, LaVeist, and Lillie-Blanton 1991; Krieger, Sidney, and Coakley 1998; Miller 1987; Osborne and Feit 1992; Wilkinson and King 1987; Williams, Lavizzo-Mourey, and Warren 1994), there is still ambiguity in its definition and conceptual clarity. A growing body of literature suggests that both the concept of race and operationalization of this concept are problematic in contemporary health research. In other social science disciplines, race is primarily represented as a categorical variable and controls for other complementary

variables (i.e. class, national origin, gender, income, etc.). However, this type of analysis tends to isolate the effects of race with covariates (Sanchez and Ybarra 2013; Saperstein, Penner, and Light 2013). The goal of this discussion is to generate dialogue concerning the complexities involving race and the need to broaden measures and indicators. This "race project" chronicles the development of race as a variable in many social science surveys since the 1950s.

RACE: A DISCUSSION ABOUT BEING MULTIFACETED AND COMPLEX

One direct consequence in understanding a more complete conceptualization of race that an individual selects her/his racial group, therefore making self-identification the "gold standard" for racial classification. Based upon the concepts of self- and social identity (Cerulo 1997; Owens, Robinson, and Smith-Lovin 2010), individuals "place themselves" within established racial categories based on criteria the individual chooses. Self-identification is "determined" by a varied range of factors. For example, there is cognitive research conducted by the Census Bureau in which follow-up interviews were performed after a person had filled out the census short form (de la Puente and McKay 1995). Individuals were asked why they selected a specific racial category on the form and often their answers reflected notions of physical features and/or colorism, ancestry, societal cues, public policies, and other external cues. Due to the reliance on preset categories, the underlying meaning or interpretation of an individual's racial identification is difficult to know, yet the end result is a count of how many persons fall within a certain pre-determined racial category.

Latinos have complicated this classification process more than other groups because a substantial portion of this community does not place itself into the current racial categories established by the Office of Management and Budget Directive 15 (OMB 1997). The revised standard has five categories for data on race: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and White. There are two categories for data on ethnicity: "Hispanic or Latino" and "Not Hispanic or Latino." Almost two-fifths (36.7%) of Latinos marked the "some other race" option in the 2010 decennial census (Humes et al. 2011, 6). Interpretations cover the gamut of explanations from respondents' "confusion as to the meaning and use of race in the United States" to a desire to categorize themselves

as a distinctive race in this country. This pattern reinforces the intersection of race and ethnicity and ways to differentiate these concepts by both researchers and the general public (López 2017; Espiritu 1992).

The contextual and situational nature of race can generate a response as to one's identity based upon homeland experiences (Garcia 2003). That is, if the race question were to be asked outside the United States, the understanding and descriptions of racial options would be different and would apply across geopolitical borders. Many social science surveys separate race and ethnicity into two distinctive concepts, while others combine race and ethnicity as configuring social groups and/or racialized groups.

The 1995 Current Population Survey conducted a race and ethnicity supplement section to explore interpretations of race, ethnicity, and national origin (Browne and Odem 2012; Flores and Telles 2012; Massey and Denton 1989; Tucker and Kojetin 1996). There was significant confusion among the respondents as to whether race and ethnicity were different or interchangeable (McKay et al. 1996). Among some foreign-born interviewees, comments about the race question suggested their response would have been different had they been answering the question in the home country rather than as a resident of the United States. For example, a Peruvian-born individual indicated that his answers would be different if he was still living in Peru as opposed to having lived in the United States for over 10 years (Bates et al. 2008). This introductory discussion about the conceptualization and measurement of race serves as a critical context from which to explore social science survey research and its developments over time.

RACE, SOCIAL STRUCTURES, AND POLICIES

In our discussion of the complexities and multi-dimensionality of race, the development of critical race theories (CRT) (Delgado and Harris 2013) contributes to the themes of this paper. Generally, CRT correlates race, racism, and power as inter-related concepts and practices. This larger perspective takes into account economics, historical accounts, context, group status and membership, self- interests, feelings and attachments, and unconscious biases and attitudes. The expansion of conceptual development had its origins in legal studies, but has permeated the fields of education, politics, ethnic studies, and radical feminism. This strand also extends our notions about race beyond the individual and inter-personal experiences.

There are basic tenets of CRT that include the following: (a) racism is an ordinary, everyday experience; (b) among persons of color there are psychological purposes and material effects, which produce less incentive to eliminate the privileged advantages for non-persons of color; and (c) the development of the products of "social construction" of social thought and relations that are invented to manipulate and marginalizes persons of color. CRT incorporates an institutional legacy, and multiple levels of societal arrangements by which race is defined and experienced. In this manner, conceptualization and measurement of race is not confined to an individual's "isolated" sense of self. This perspective moves away from a focus on individual agency and achievement with minimal attention to social structures and biases.

A definition developed by the Lawrence et al. (2004) defines structural racism as "a system in which public policies, institutional practices, cultural representations, and other norms work in various, often reinforce ways to perpetuate racial group inequity. It identifies dimensions of our history and culture that has allowed privileges associated with 'whiteness' and disadvantages associated with 'color' to endure and adapt over time." White privilege has given "included groups" the access to advantages that excluded groups have not had (Simms and Waxman 2016).

In this wider context, the concept of structural racism and white privilege are inter-twined. That is, white Americans have acknowledged that persons of color have race-related disadvantages and take the form of "additional baggage" that accompanies them over the course of their lives. At the same time, there is a reluctance to grant "male and white privilege" (McIntosh 1988), but a greater recognition that "structural racism" can and has played a part of racial inequalities and lived experiences. White privilege has given "included groups" the access to advantages that excluded groups have not had (Simms and Waxman 2016).

A challenge for researchers (among others) is that once these structures are in place, actively thinking about race, privilege, or discrimination are connected to these privilege systems in which disadvantage people of color usually is not part of the measurement and analytical frames. For example, historical discriminatory processes regarding housing segregation downgraded people of color to communities with less desirable housing, lower housing appreciation, lower wealth accumulation, low savings, and access only to poorly resourced schools, which limits their status and opportunity for mobility (Simms and Waxman 2016). The consequences of housing segregation can lead to lesser access to higher education and postsecondary training for persons of color and hindering competition

for better job opportunities. As a result, these structural disadvantages also hamper future generations from moving up the economic ladder. But many research approaches focus upon the individual experiences of persons of color and do not integrate concrete measures of social structures and practices into a multi-level analysis.

Some studies have sought to create a direct measurement of racial subordination in terms of power relations or institutional racism. The desire is to find a way to tap into this dimension, representing the underlying basis for the existence of racial categories that stems from power, control, status, access, and inequality. Structural racism represents a macro-level system, social forces, and institutions, ideologies, and processes that interact with one another to generate and reinforce inequities among racial/ethnic groups (Williams 1999; Williams and Mohammed 2013; Paradies 2006). Studies such as Gee and Ford (2011) and Harrell et al. (2011) identify four forms of racism: structural (i.e., poverty, and underemployment); cultural (i.e., devaluing non-dominant cultures); institutional (i.e., institutions of mobility like schools, labor markets), and individual (i.e., discrimination and prejudice). The work of Gee and Ford (2011) isolates three domains from which structural racism operates. They include social segregation (primarily residential segregation) and its outcomes (i.e., quality of schools, access to labor markets); immigration policy (i.e., bases for admission, criteria for citizenship, selected punitive/restrictive policies); and "intergenerational drag" (i.e., the persistence over time of limited or downward intergenerational mobility). Analytically, the inclusion of structural racism strongly suggests the use of multilevel modeling to incorporate the different individually relevant factors as well as structural/contextual components.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

I have characterized the conceptualization and measurement of race as primarily a categorical variable, a set classification scheme, and primarily static in nature with racial categories stemming from an individual's own sense of self and placement within group categories. This discussion of multifacetedness includes additional dimensions of race that should be part of the race concept and provide more effective and accurate measures. Race has to do with differential treatment, unequal status, and differential power relations.

For example, health disparities research treats race as a complex and multidimensional construct that includes institutional and internalized racism and examines how these dimensions affect health outcomes and usage. Obviously, race impacts other important sociopolitical phenomena (CQ Researcher 2014; Ford and Kelly 2005; Lin and Kelsey 2000; McClain and Stewart 2013); therefore one cannot talk about race without talking about discrimination and racism (Bonilla-Silva and Biaoccho 2008; King and Williams 1995; Viruell-Fuentes 2011). In the field of political science, a variety of measures have linked racial identity to experiences of discrimination and racism. These include the concepts of group affiliation, affinity, and "linked fate" that political scientists (Dawson 1995; Masuoka 2006; Sanchez 2006) believe serve to heighten racial group membership and affect life chances, health outcomes, and political behaviors (Braveman 2012; Camara et al. 2011; Chae et al. 2011; Fiscella et al. 2002).

Experiences with discriminatory behaviors and attitudes as well as perceived discrimination toward one's racial group have been shown to vary significantly with "White" versus non-White racial status (Ahmed, Mohammed, and Williams 2007; Kinder and Sanders 1996; Williams et al. 2010). Questions that measure racial/ethnic discrimination have been either a "one- or two-stage" protocol (Shariff-Marco et al. 2011). The one-stage discrimination item places race and ethnicity as the basis for experiencing unfair treatment or discrimination. The two-stage discrimination items asks about any experiences with discrimination and then follows up as to the respondent's understanding about the bases of such behavior. If race/ethnicity is seen as the primary factor, this serves as evidence of racial discrimination.

The structure of these discrimination questions can affect the level of reporting of discrimination and indication of multiple acts of discrimination. These measures serve to differentiate between the types of behaviors and attitudes more common to a specific racial group. For example, Latinos might be more prone to cite discriminatory behaviors/attitudes regarding having an accent and not being viewed as smart as others while African Americans might cite experiencing poor treatment in public spaces and experiencing reactions of fear on the part of others (Shariff-Marco et al. 2011). There remains a number of measurement issues about items capturing discrimination such as wording use, language of the interview (Ahmed et al. 2007; Lee and Pérez 2014), and the reliability of items across different racial and ethnic groups. Another important element regarding discrimination is the distinction between

perceived versus actual experience. Some research indicates that the linkage between these two aspects is modest and each produces independent effects as to attitudes, behaviors, and health status (Borrell et al. 2006; Williams 1999).

SKIN COLOR/PHENOTYPES

Social scientists have found that phenotype, skin color in this discussion, is part of the racial formation of a groups' status and some (Hochschild and Weaver 2007; Prewitt 2005) have proposed skin color as a "better" surrogate to capture how race is viewed in American society. As a result, capturing race involves the concept of colorism and the effects of skin color on social status, opportunity structures, and inequality. For example, many social outcomes for African Americans, especially those who are darker skinned African Americans, on average, make less money (Bowman, Muhammad, and Ifatunji 2004; Hersch 2006; Keith and Herring, 1991), living in more highly segregated areas (Massey et al. 2003), and even having a more difficult time garnering votes when running for office than African Americans with lighter skin color (Terkildsen 1999). In short, skin color serves to pattern significant marginalization among African Americans (Allen, Telles and Hunter 2000; and Hunter 1998).

In the case of Latinos, skin color also has effects on social outcomes. For example, Murguía and Telles (1996) find that darker skinned Mexican Americans receive lower earnings than their lighter skinned co-ethnics. Similarly, Morales (2008) finds that skin color can lead to Latinos being segmented within labor markets, with darker skin Latinos being stratified into lower-waged sectors of the labor market. Examining the impact of skin color on occupational prestige, Espino and Franz (2002) found that skin color magnified lower prestige for Latinos of Mexican and Cuban origin, but not for Puerto Ricans (McGovern 2017). Specific to political equality, Tafoya (2004) found that a U.S.-born Latino's "whiteness" was clearly and consistently associated with higher social status, higher levels of civic participation, and a stronger sense of social acceptance. Finally, scholars have compared the impact of phenotype across different countries (Montalvo and Codina 2001; Perreira and Telles 2014; Telles, Flores, and Urrea-Giraldo 2015; Uhlmann et al. 2002) and found greater degrees of social and economic inequality for darker skinned individuals.

The inclusion of skin color as an indicator of race produces measurement challenges with differing approaches. Most commonly, the

respondent is placed in a skin tone category (ranging from lighter to darker skin ratings) based on her/his self-report or the report of an external observer. The respondents' basis for such self-assignment (as well as confirmed by a third party) is usually based on the individual's experiences, self-concept, social identity/ies, social networks, and other external influences. The skin color measure is usually self-reported on a five-point scale continuum from very light to very dark. Social meaning and value in U.S. society places a more positive value on being lighter skinned so scores on seldom are distributed over the full range of the scale (Garcia 1991a; 1991b; Hutchings, Jefferson, and Yadan 2015).

To measure skin color as a race indicator, another approach has been for the interviewer to assign the respondent's placement on the skin color scale. This resulted in "race-of-interviewer effect" in which interviewers perceive greater variations in the skin tones of same race respondents than among different race respondents (i.e., Black interviewers categorizing White respondents as lighter than their White interviewer counterparts and vice versa; Hill 2002). More recently, Chan et al. (2005) have included both self-reported skin "phenotype" as well as readings from a narrow band reflectance spectrometer. The primary purpose of this approach was to make "precise" measures of skin color to be used in the evaluation of patients and expand the clinical information collected (Chan et al. 2005). At the same time, the accuracy and precision of a reflectance spectrometer fails to capture the social meaning, status, and context from which skin color and race as a social construction are interconnected.

Social science scholars such as Gravlee, Dressler, and Bernard (2005) find that ascribed skin color (rather than self-placed skin tone rating) is more important in predicting health outcomes than the more "objective" clinical measure of reflectometer-determined skin color. These findings have potential implications for skin color measurement and begin to move towards the more structural/societal aspects of racism that Dressler et al. (2005) and others (Gee and Ford 2011; Williams and Mohammed 2009) note as having greater impact on health outcomes. Capturing "measures of skin color" represents some serious challenges for survey researchers as to how to implement measures/items to fit into a survey format. This discussion of skin color focuses on the social construction of race; not only how the individual self-identifies racially, but how others do the same. Thus, the source of information about one's skin color is an important element measuring skin color.

RACIALIZATION

Our discussion of race and its multi-dimensional layers has seen greater inclusion of the concept of "racialization." One of the conceptual and measurement challenges is differentiating this concept as a process versus end stage or category. That is, what constitutes racialization (i.e. on what bases, what are societal and political processes, group status, etc.) and the categorization of a group as racialized? We can use the following as a working definition of racialization: the process of the creation of a new racial category in which considerations of class, phenotype, religion, legal status, nativity, and "otherness" in a hierarchical racial and social order are the operating characteristics (Vidal-Ortiz 2004; Grosofoguel 2004). In a U.S. context, Omi and Winant (1994, 64) see racialization as an extension of racial meaning to a previously unclassified relationship, social practice or group. This reflects a process of racial formation such as the Latin Americanization as part of the American racial categories (Bonilla-Silva 2004). In addition, discussion of racialization suggests that racial meaning is given to numerous forms of differences that could include ideology, cultural traits, religion, without the need to rely exclusively on phenotypical differences (Miles 1993). Finally, racialization represents a process of creating new racial categories. In doing so, there is a real need to understand how groups are "rejected" from whiteness and how race and racism changes a dependency on social and racial context (Selod and Embrick 2013).

While the exploration of racialization focuses upon a process by which groups (based upon a variety of aggregations) are "created" into new categories the general notion of race is the primary reference; racial categories represent racial hierarchies (Bashi 1999). That is, racial ideologies and the racialization process is instructed by status and power differentials and functions as an expediter and a byproduct of the intersection of race and class stratification (Cole 1999). Thus the inclusion of racialization as part of the multi-dimensional "view" of race reinforces the complex relationship of categories, categorization processes, institutional structures and practices along with the individually based sense of who they are and the social context in which they experience their daily lives.

RACE AS DYNAMIC

As I mentioned early in this paper, an important dimension of race involves the dynamic nature of racial identification (Saperstein 2006;

Saperstein and Penner 2012), its development, and multi-racial identity (Bratter and Gorman 2011; Masuoka 2008). In the case of the former, longitudinal studies (Saperstein and Penner 2012) have noted that respondents have changed their racial identification over time. Some associated factors have to do with a change in status or situation (i.e. going on welfare, incarceration, unemployment, inter-marriage, etc.). There is a racialization process in which ascribing stereotypes and characteristics to groups outside of the extant racial categories (i.e. immigrants, religious groups, etc.) are associated with race and racial inequality resulting in individuals constantly creating and renegotiating their everyday interactions. Saperstein, Penner, and Light (2013) propose that an individual's race is best conceptualized as a set of propensities rather than a single mutually exclusive category and that these propensities change over time and across contexts.

An overall thread in discussing additional dimensions to capture race is the understanding of race as fluid, complex, and inter-related with other concomitant attributes and socio-demographic "traits" (i.e. class, language, nativity, etc.) and cultural qualities. Netting the breadth and scope of race presents serious challenges for researchers in terms of conceptualization and measurement, but it also provides added opportunities to understand an important range of socio-political and economic conditions and outcomes.

The discussion of how race is conceptualized points to the necessity of providing breadth to the concept of race and its measures. The extent that race goes beyond categorical groupings enables researchers to treat and measure the fuller meaning and consequences of race. Relying on a limited scope of race, primarily in categorical terms, serves as a "research-based forum" to assess and extend the theoretical and empirical development of this significant concept and its realistic "lived experiences."

This discussion speaks to the need to expand the scope of what we mean by race, how we understand, and how we measure race in order to encompass its fullness in everyday experiences and consequences. It is this broader discussion regarding race within the social sciences that marks the crux of what I refer to as "the race project." This project represents an unusual attempt to chronicle and systematically analyze the scope, content and producers of empirical social science efforts. The examination of social science studies that have included race as a variable enables me to view how race has been used, who have designed these studies, and any trends over time of broadening the measures of race.

The next section outlines the protocols used in establishing the Race Project database, coding schemes, augmenting information from the ICPSR meta-data pages, and the variables created. Again, the scope of this effort lies with an inspection of the race-related variables in each study, characteristics of the PIs, and contributing factors affecting the scope of race-related items in each of the studies.

RACE PROJECT PROTOCOLS AND RACE-RELATED TERMS

The crux of this analysis deals with the inclusion of race used in studies in the ICPSR study collection. ICPSR is the world's largest social science data archive and celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2012; it continues to expand its data collection in a wide range of the social and behavioral sciences, both domestically and internationally. ICPSR maintains a data archive of more than 500,000 files of research in the social sciences. It hosts 16 specialized collections of data in education, aging, criminal justice, substance abuse, terrorism, and other fields. One should note the distinction between files, series, and studies. The former refers to each data file (i.e. adult survey, child survey, cohort one, etc.) while series refers to reoccurring surveys (i.e. American National Election Surveys, PSID, Health and Retirement Survey, etc.). Finally, studies refer to a specific study with a primary content focus (i.e. Juvenile Recidivism; New York Health Interview Study; etc.). Over time, ICPSR has developed research-related tools so that researchers can search its collections from a variety of filters. This project utilized a search variable engine that identified studies, which include "keyword" variables.

For this project, the key criteria for the selection of specific studies were the use of "race" as the keyword. A compiled list of studies that were identified was generated (see Appendix). The original list was reviewed to remove studies in series for which the survey instrument was the same across administrations. As the researcher, I worked with four University of New Mexico doctoral students to serve as coders for the identified studies. A small grants award from the University of Michigan enabled me to fund their time on inputting the study- related information. Consulting other ICPSR IT personnel, the variable search function that had been implemented only covered about 60% of the total collection. A year later, working with Michigan's Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program, an undergraduate was approved to add additional

studies to the variable search engine. As a result, a total of 255 studies represent the Race Project (See Appendix).

Our earlier discussion of race and the social sciences centers on the conceptualization of race, its measures and use by social science researchers. In order to analytically explore the "treatment" and measurement of race, the coding schema attempted to "capture" critical information about the funder, PIs, race-related items and the intersection of these major components. Since the criteria for inclusion of the selected studies was the inclusion of a race variable, this study was interested in the range of race-related items that could be found in addition to the "traditional race variable."

The search protocol included the following search terms: discrimination, racism, racialization, skin tone, skin color, racial, and ethnicity. If the study included any of these additional race-related terms, the coders would then create a string of information such as question wording, type of response categories, number of response categories, and source of the information (i.e. respondent or interviewer). The range of race-related items went from a single item to as many as 38. In the case of the latter the questions were asked of both the respondents and others with a series of follow-ups. For example, if the question dealt with a discriminatory experience, there could be follow-ups regarding occurrence of incidence, context of incidence, racial/ethnic characteristics of the "perpetrator, etc."

Additional data that was collected about the selected studies included the PIs, year of the selected study, period the study covered, and funding organizations. With each identified study, the ICPSR study number provided important information based from the "meta- study page." Explicit inputted variables included the name of the study, year(s) covered, names of the PIs, funders, scope of the study, cross-sectional or longitudinal study, and other information about the survey design, sample characteristics, and related literature publications.

Our coding effort was expanded by adding additional information about the PIs. This included the following: gender, race/ethnicity, discipline, and year of Ph.D. The expansive range of the web enabled our team to find this kind of information. Each coder was assigned a grouping of studies to include all of these elements of the race project. Faculty researchers served as the quality control reviewers and protocols were established so that ambiguities as to the appropriateness and veracity of the information were checked by at least two other coders. An Excel database was formatted to record all of the collected information. Subsequently, the

excel spreadsheet was imported into SPSS data file as both string and numeric variables. The existence of multiple categories (i.e. up to 18 Principal Investigators, incidence of up to 38 search terms, up to 14 funders per project) resulted in a very wide file and the study was the primary organizing structure.

Initially, the database was formatted as an excel spreadsheet so that information about each selected study was submitted "horizontally" and multiple race-related items, multiple numbers of PIs, multiple funders, and associated characteristics of PIs were recorded on additional lines. The conversion of the excel database into a SPSS file resulted in the creation of several numeric variables for many of the string variables. The initial file structure created several challenges, which were eventually overcome in order to conduct the resultant bivariate analysis.

RACE PROJECT PROFILES AND CONTENTS

As a result of filtering the ICPSR collection via its variable search engine, a total of 257 studies (as mentioned earlier) were included in the race project. Of the studies that are series (i.e. conducted periodically over time using the same core module(s), a represented administration was selected for inclusion. At the time of the initial "pass" of the ICPSR collection, the variable search engine only covered about three-fifths of the entire collection. In the fall and winter of 2013–2014, an additional "pass" was conducted to add the other studies now linked to the variable search engine.

The description of the key variables in the database represents the major foci of this analysis. The first observation is the expansion of race-related terms/concepts in social science surveys since the 1950s. For example, in the 1950s, the typical racial category would have been "white" and "other." In subsequent decades, "Black" and various other labels became more the standard as other racial categories were added. It should be emphasized that the primary scope of this race project deals with the greater of inclusion of race-related items beyond a categorical racial variable.

The next dimension dealt with the researchers, their background, discipline training, and period in which their studies were conducted. The inclusion of race-related questions, especially multiple ones, would be influenced by the researchers' conceptualization of race. In this case, when they were trained (year of Ph.D.), their discipline, and such

background characteristics as gender and race/ethnicity could affect how their research orientation is reflected by these experiences and characteristics. As a result, my analysis will examine the coded studies along these dimensions in relation to the number(s) of race-related items in the studies.

In Table 1, I present some basic "profile" information about the race project studies. Chronologically, the more contemporary period of 2000 and beyond represents almost two-fifths of the database. The 1960s (14.0%) and 1990s (22.4%) constitute the other two decade periods with the most studies including race as a variable.

The included social science studies ranged from those that covered a gamut of topics to those more specialized with specific targeted content areas. A review of the study description enabled me to categorize the central focus of the studies. It should be noted that in addition to

Table 1. General overview of ICPSR social science studies

Overview characteristics of studies	Number of studies	Percentage
Periods studies conducted		
Before 1960	8	3.1
1961–1970	35	13.7
1971–1980	28	10.9
1981–1990	21	8.2
1991–2000	58	22.t
2000–2011	106	41.4
Scope of study focus		
Criminal justice	52	20.4
Adolescents/children	26	10.2
Economics	10	3.9
Health	38	14.9
Sociological	36	14.1
Demographic	15	5.9
Race/ethnicity	33	11.8
Politics/public opinion	39	15.3
Miscellaneous	9	3.5
Numbers of funders (per project)		
One	64	27.0
Two	81	33.8
Three	45	19.0
Four	12	4.6
Five to Six	10	4.0
Seven or more	27	11.3
Total *N*	256	

ICPSR's general archive (which covers a diverse range of social science studies); its collection also includes several topical archives (which are more content specific). As a result, the frequencies in some of the content areas are driven, in part, by the topical archive's sponsor and their requirements for data deposit. The area of criminal justice (i.e. incarceration, sentencing, juveniles, recidivism, etc.) has the greatest number of studies (20.4%) followed by public opinion and politically oriented surveys (15.3%). In the latter, organizations such as television networks, major newspapers, and the American National Election surveys are major drivers for this category.

Sociological studies (i.e. lifestyles, values, etc.), and health content surveys (i.e. health status, conditions, access, utilization, etc.) were the second largest category of studies. The rise of health-related studies are more marked since the 1990s. Interestingly, studies that focused primarily on race and ethnicity constituted the fourth highest number of identified studies (11.8%). Experientially, the scope of studies that would expectantly fall under the social science "umbrella" is well represented, with the possible exception of economics.

The ICPSR meta-data page includes who were the funders of the study, and how many funders supported each study, so that the next additional information in Table 1 reflects that information. For the most part, each of the funded studies was supported by one or two funding sources (combined 60.8%). If one was to examine the changes in the number of multiple funders per project, especially among foundation-based organizations, the economic cycles of the nation's economy might be an important consideration. In time of economic downturn, foundation portfolios can be less robust. It should be noted that among the identified studies, a significant portion were funded and investigated by federal agencies and the study was conducted by their own research personnel. Consideration of this aspect of the selected studies affected my characterization of the PIs. That is, the agency conducting the studies did not identify specific PIs. In any event, the nature of funded research lends itself to additional discussions about funding strategies, funders' research priorities and investigators' research focus.

While support for social science research is vital, it is the PIs who design, conduct and analyze the socio-political and economic phenomena. Table 2 provides some background information about the PIs that could affect the use and measurement of race variables in their studies. Of the 255 studies in this database, slightly less than one-half of them were conducted by governmental agencies or public interest organizations, which had no

Table 2. Characteristics of principal investigators

Principal investigators (PIs)' characteristics[a]	Numbers	Percentages
Disciplines of PIs		
Political science	59	17.3
Psychology	72	21.2
Sociology	118	34.9
Health related fields	19	5.7
Law	12	3.6
Economics	28	8.1
Other social science fields	30	9.0
Race/ethnicity of PIs		
White/Anglo	279	81.5
African American	20	5.8
Latino	30	8.5
Asian American	7	1.5
American Indian	1	.3
Some other race	8	2.3
Gender of PIs		
Females	124	35.0
Males	228	65.0
N	352	

[a] The sources for the Principal Investigators' characteristics were not derived from the ICPSR meta-data page. They were obtained through a variety of internet sources such educational institutions, investigators' web pages, obituaries, Google Scholar, and other sites.

specific PI(s) identified. Of the remaining studies, a total number of 313 researchers were involved. Representation by discipline indicated that sociologists constituted more than one-third (36.2%), followed by psychologists (22.8%), and then political scientists (17.3%). The mean number of PIs per study was 3.4. An examination of the racial and ethnic background of the PIs, as well as the other background information, was retrieved by exploring other sources. The vast majority of the PIs, 283, were white representing 82% of all PIs. Latinos (8.4%) and African Americans (6.1%) constituted the largest racial/ethnic groups of the remaining PIs. Note that it was uncommon to find the clusters of racial/ethnic PIs as part of the same project and whose focus was on a minority-related community and topics. The gender distribution of PIs is nearly a two-to-one ratio with males representing 64.7% of all PIs. Some additional information about the PIs and funding sources is presented in Table 3.

While information regarding the PI's disciplinary training can provide some important context by which the manner of race is examined, the period a PI received his or her training can shape their theoretical and analytical orientations to research questions and topics, which include

Table 3. Additional characteristics about principal investigators and funders

Characteristics	Numbers	Percentage
Year of receiving Ph.D.		
<1960	21	7.2
1960–1969	28	9.6
1970–1979	91	31.2
1980–1989	70	23.3
1990–1999	60	20.2
2000–2012	26	8.6
Funding sources for studies[a]		
Private Foundations	99	23.8
National Science Foundation	23	5.5
National Institutes of Health	48	11.7
Department of Justice	116	28.8
Human & Health Services	52	12.9
Department of Education	22	5.5
Bureau of the Census	22	5.5
Other Federal Agencies	16	4.0
Universities	12	2.5

[a] The coding scheme for the identification of funding sources was taken from the ICPSR meta-data pages and categorized in the presented groupings with specific privates foundations collapsed into the private foundation category.

race as a variable. With the context and analysis focusing on race as a variable, there is an established body of literature that notes the development of the conceptualization and treatment of race since the 1960s. We were able to locate not only PI's disciplines, but also their year of their Ph.D. degree. The modal decade was 1970–1979 as 29.1% of the Ph.D.s were awarded during this period, followed by the period of 1980–1989 (24.9%). As a matter of fact, over three-fourths of the PIs received their degrees since 1970.

In Table 3, the type of funders supporting each of the selected studies is presented. The most frequent funder was the Department of Justice ($n = 116$), followed by private foundations ($n = 96$). Many funding organizations initiate specific "request for proposals" on particular research areas. It is difficult to recreate that element, but clearly governmental agencies have been a major source of funding of social science research.

Finally, the last descriptive table (Table 4) focuses on the actual type of race-related terms found in each of the studies. Our earlier discussion about the structure and protocols to conduct this race project require each selected study to have a race variable. At the same time, the development of social science research that includes race as a variable has grown

Table 4. Race items in the ICPR studies

Racial related items	Numbers	Percentages
Racial terms[a]		
Race	256	100.0
Ethnicity	108	41.6
Discrimination	32	11.8
Racism	2	.8
Racialization/racial	85	33.3
Skin tone/skin color	3	1.2
Some other race	34	12.9
Number of race-related terms within each study		
One term	107	42.0
Two terms	40	15.7
Three terms	29	11.4
Four terms	15	5.1
Five terms	12	4.7
Six or more[b]	54	21.2

[a] In the discussion of the selection process for identifying the surveys in the ICPSR collections, the terms below represent the specific terms searched on.
[b] The range of raced-related terms for the six and more was 6–35 incidences within the study.

to view race as multi-dimensional, dynamic, and relational. In the case of the latter, one's racial/ethnic identity is not solely the function of individual choice, but geographical location, others' perceptions and stereotypes, and social situations that influence racial identity.

Generally speaking, the "race" question, in these surveys, is phrased "what is your race" or "how would you describe your race"? What has changed over the time period of these studies is the range of categories used. That is, surveys in the 1950s would generally have included only the options of "white" and "other." The 1970s and beyond began to include "white", variant labels of African Americans (i.e. Negro, black, Afro-American, etc.) (Hirschman, Alba, and Farley 2000; Snipp 2003). The 80s introduced racial categories beyond the Black/white paradigm with the inclusion of "some other race" and later, designations of Asian and Native Americans, and finally Latinos/Hispanics. The Office of Management and Budget Directive 15 established the predominant racial categories used for all governmental surveys and information gathering on race and ethnicity.

While the inclusion of a race variable in each study was a prerequisite for inclusion into this study, our exploration of race did not end there. We noted other "race-related terms" to include additional variable searches. They included ethnicity, racialization, racism, discrimination (perceived

and actual), skin tone or color, and some other race. Table 4 shows the frequency of other race-related terms. Ethnicity is the most frequent term, followed by racialization/racism. In many cases, the race question is combined with ethnicity providing the option of answering what is your race/ethnicity OR your race or ethnicity. Williams (1994) had noted earlier that race and ethnicity were used interchangeably in the articles he analyzed in Health Services Journal. The racialization/racism questions were asked largely in terms of perceived differences by race and its impacts on life chances or the extent of racism in American society. The well-establish concept of linked fate (Dawson 1995) is associated with these concepts of racialization and racism. Williams and Mohammed (2009) also introduced the concept of internal racism, which involves the internalization of racial inferiority by individuals of the racially marginalized group.

The other frequently used race-related term is racially based discrimination. In most instances, the discrimination question will ask the respondent if he/she has experienced discriminatory behaviors in general or in specific contexts (i.e. at work, public accommodations, school, etc.). In some cases, the discrimination question includes race as part of the discrimination experience OR a two-part sequence, which includes experiencing discrimination and then the respondent's assessment of the basis for such treatment (i.e. race, gender, class, language, immigrant, etc.).

The inclusion of "some other race" appears to be an attempt to capture information from individuals who do not find themselves "fitting into" the more commonly used racial categories (Grieco and Cassidy 2001; Logan 2003). A distinction for studies that include the "some other race" option is whether an open-ended response is allowed and recorded (Garcia 2015). Finally, the most infrequent race-related terms are phenotypical characteristics, most likely skin color or skin tone. While only three such studies include skin color or tone, this researcher is quite aware of the growth of substantive focus on this dimension of race/ethnicity (Hochschild 2011; Perreira and Telles 2014; Tafoya 2004).

This race project may serve as an impetus to discuss the range of race-related terms that could be considered in order to understand and examine the construction of race and its relationships to a variety of sociopolitical and economic statuses/conditions. The results in Table 4 still demonstrate that if race is a variable within a study, the preponderance is a single item (42.0%). Another 15.7% of the studies have two race-related items. We did find one-fifth of the studies to have six or more race-related terms (one study had 37 items). We have found that

when studies have greater numbers of items (usually more than three), the other race-related items/terms include racism, racialization, discrimination and the like. In addition to the respondent's answers, the question battery also derived information from other members of the household.

Tables 1–3 establish a portrayal of the characteristics of the race project studies, the researchers who conducted the studies, and the range of race-related terms used. The last two tables represent the "intersection" of characteristic of the PIs and the range of race-related terms in their studies. In the previous tables, it was noted that PIs who received their Ph.D.s in the 1970s and 1980s were more represented in the race project studies. In addition, women and minority researchers were underrepresented and there were more sociologists. Do these descriptive characteristics carry over into a "broader" inclusion of race-related variables?

If we examined when the PIs received their Ph.D.s, proportionately, those recipients during the 1980s (50.8%) had five or more race-related items, followed by Ph.D. recipients of the 2000s (47.8%) and those from the 1970s (35.9). In terms of the absolute inclusion of the numbers of race-related items, those researchers who received their Ph.D.s in the 1970s were 78, and followed by the 1980s Ph.D.s (63). While not exactly a linear relationship as one move through the decades, the pattern of adding more race-related items is evident.

Table 5 compares the period in which the studies were conducted and the frequency of the number of race-related terms used. It was not until the decades of the 1990s and beyond that more extensive use of multiple "measures" of race was evident in the social science surveys. During the 1990s, approximately one-third of these studies include four or more race-related items. This percentage increased to 42.5% since the 2000s.

We explore our bivariate comparisons a little further by examining some additional characteristics of the PIs (i.e. gender, race/ethnicity, and discipline) and the range of race-related items utilized. The two additional background characteristics are gender and race/ethnicity of the PIs. From the more descriptive tables, there was greater representation of males and non-minority group members among the researchers.

An examination of gender and range of race-related items shows virtually no differences. That is, female researchers used four or more race-related variables (42.1%) as opposed to their male counterparts using four or more (39.8%). The most noticeable differences lay with the race/ethnicity of the PIs. Slightly over one-third of the white PIs used four or more race-related variables. In contrast, over twice as many (percentage-wise)

Table 5. Comparison of characteristics of principal investigators and range of race-related items incorporated in their studies

	Number of race-related variables in the study					
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five or more	Total
Period PI received their Ph.D.*						
1938–1960	13	4	0	1	4	22
1961–1970	13	4	2	4	3	26
1971–1980	29	9	9	3	28	78
1981–1990	18	5	7	3	32	65
1991–2000	17	4	5	6	21	53
2000–	11	1	1	0	11	24
Institutional studies	22	5	5	6	13	51
Period in which study was conducted*						
<1960	9	2	0	0	1	12
1961–1970	5	1	4	2	1	13
1971–1980	16	7	2	4	2	31
1981–1990	10	6	5	2	1	24
1991–2000	22	10	7	7	14	60
2001–	29	14	11	13	34	101
All studies	91	40	29	28	53	242[a]

*Statistically significant at the <.05 level.

[a] The total of studies includes those cases in which the number of race-related items was not calculable (*n*-12).

African American, Latino, and Asian American researchers used four or more race-related items. More specifically, 82.4% of African American, 73.9% of Latinos, and 100% of Asian American researchers used four or more items. Does this finding represent a greater saliency and attention that minority researchers give when including race in their survey projects? A partial explanation lies with a substantial number of minority researchers who were part of the same research project and race/ethnicity was one of the central foci of the study. At the same time, if race is a central focus, does this ensure a broader range of race-related variables being included? If so, is this pattern more the case for minority researchers? Overall, it is clear that from the small representation of minority researchers in the race project studies, race receives broader inclusion.

The last aspect of the researchers' background deals with their discipline training. Two observations are discernable. The first is that researchers

in the mainstream social sciences (i.e. Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology) are comparable in the percentages of race-related items in their surveys that include four or more items (42.3%, 38.6%, and 44.2%, respectively). On the other hand, what have been categorized as other social sciences and non-social science fields have almost one-half of their studies containing four or more items. Having taught several workshops involving the health field as well as methodological issues involving race and ethnicity for quite a number of years, the literature searches show a greater preponderance of citations from health-related fields, social work, and inter-disciplinary degree programs. In the conclusion section, I will expand on this point and others (Table 6).

Table 6. Comparisons among principal investigators' characteristics and range of race-related items used in study

	Number of race-related variables in the study					
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five or more	Total
PI's gender*						
Female	39	17	10	10	40	116
Male	86	18	17	12	72	205
PI's race*						
White	115	31	23	12	77	258
African American	2	0	1	0	14	17
Latino	4	0	2	5	13	24
Asian American	0	0	0	1	6	7
Native American	0	0	0	0	0	1
Other	1	0	0	0	0	1
Institutional organizations	50	29	24	19	24	146
PI's discipline*						
Political science	24	1	5	6	18	54
Psychology	26	13	4	2	26	71
Sociology	36	10	12	10	37	106
Health fields	10	1	0	0	7	18
Law	6	2	0	0	3	11
Other social sciences	2	1	1	0	6	10
Economics	2	1	1	0	0	4
Other non-social science disciplines	10	2	1	1	12	26
Institutional organizations	47	30	22	19	23	141

* A bivariate analysis was conducted between number of race related items and each of the Principal Investigators' characteristics. An * indicates a significant coefficient at the <.05 level.

THE RACE PROJECT: OVERVIEW AND PERSISTENT ISSUES

The ability to create a database of social science survey research has enabled this researcher to measure the use of race over six decades. An effort that represents a long, tedious, persistent, and focused endeavor, although slow, suggests that the process was able to gain momentum with the assistance of colleagues and graduate students at the University of New Mexico and the University of Michigan. While this statement may seem more like an acknowledgment, it represents an important element of social science related research that is seldom undertaken. For example, a similar research area is the matching of voter data with the geographic reference to their precincts over numerous elections and years. In both cases, the investment of time, comparability over time, and elements of data harmonization and verification can be too daunting and labor intensive to undertake or make it worthwhile. Nevertheless, such attempts have the possibility of assessing the patterns of dealing as in the case, with race in social science surveys, as well as directing some broader discussions about the meaning, conceptualization, and measurement of race and its corollary concepts.

As a result of this examination, some noticeable trends have arisen. Generally, studies that were conducted in earlier time periods were less sensitive to multiple race categories than those conducted more recently. The delineation of racial categories (i.e. African American, Asian, Native American, etc.) represents both the growing diversity of the American people, and the official OMB classification schema of racial categories. While this study did not explore the labels used to describe racial groupings, this aspect signifies another dimension of understanding race.

Many of the studies that are coded into this project's database involve the interviewer asking the respondent about their race. On average, the more recent the study, the more racial categories it recognized and listed. This could be the result of several factors, some of which go hand in hand. One is that the diversity of the country has increased overall, thus creating more diverse respondent groups that are accounted for by the conductors of research. Another is the fact that over the course of contemporary surveys, the problems that arise from non-response of the extant racial categorizations has gained more attention. Thus researchers have realized the need for inclusion of more racial categories in their interviews (as well as allowing for multiple responses). Currently the U.S. Census Bureau One is reconsidering a change in the race and ethnicity questions for the 2020 decennial census (U.S. Bureau of the

Census 2017). For this round, the alternatives include the addition of MENA (Middle Eastern-North African) and the folding in of the Spanish origin (ethnicity) item into the race question so that Hispanic/Spanish origin would be one of the racial options.

On the other hand, when race has multiple responses and is used as an analytical variable, data reduction usually entails assigning the respondent into a primary race category. This is, most often, the result of the responded being asked what their "primary race" is. Several consequences of this approach are that the assumption of "primary race" is not context "dependent" and that individuals perceive themselves as being in a singular race categorization. Finally, the researcher is unable to determine on what basis a person puts him/herself into a racial category (i.e. self-image, phenotypical characteristics, group identity, perceptions by others, etc.). Clearly my discussion of the concept of race posits a more complex understanding of race and the breadth of measures necessary to "capture" what race is and means.

At the same time, surveys can include the protocol for the interviewer to make certain assessments about the race of the respondent (more so in face to face interviews). By asking the respondent how he/she perceives others placing him/her racially. These aspects of race can characterize the notion of racial identification as more than self-identification, which also includes institutional actions/policies that establish racial categories, and perceived racial classification by others. This perspective places the notion of race as contextual, interactional, and dynamic. Understanding race entails both measures of self-identified and socially assigned racial category(ies).

In addition to examining studies that included race as a variable, the race project collected information about the PIs. Since it is the researchers who design the studies and determine what items to include, the concepts and possible relationships to examine and what measures to include and construct. In the race project, several background characteristics were included (i.e. gender, race/ethnicity, discipline, and year of doctorate). Interestingly, year of receiving Ph.D. and more nuanced and numerous questions pertaining to race is not a linear relationship. That is, researchers trained in the 1970s and 1980s are more inclined to use multiple race-related terms. While there is some variation across traditional social science disciplines and greater use of race-related terms, a more noticeable pattern was evident among researchers from other than the more "prominent" social sciences and inter-disciplinary programs. This was much more evident among researchers in the public health fields. Overall,

researchers in the less "prominent" social science fields and/or interdisciplinary training seem to incorporate a broader notion of what race involves and/or how race serves a more expansive focus of their research endeavors. One possible explanation lies with the longstanding tradition of treating race as a categorical variable in the "main" social science disciplines while more inter-disciplinary-oriented fields make the connections on the multi-dimensionality of race across situations, social structures, and contexts.

The most critical aspect of a researchers' background is their racial or ethnic identification. That is, the proclivity to use multiple race-related items is much more the case for racial and ethnic researchers. It has been noted that there is a clustering of minority scholars engaged in specific projects. The synergy of minority researchers and the bases for collaborative ventures can also be a contributor for the broader inclusion of race-related items. The field of race and ethnicity has expanded in terms of greater numbers of articles that focus on race and ethnicity, a larger pool of researchers (minority and non-minorities), and organized sections in most social science associations. These developments can have the impact of legitimizing a previously "marginalized" sub-field and infusing more mainstream approaches OR encourage race and ethnicity researchers to push for more innovation.

The continued relevance of including race in social science research affords more opportunities to evaluate the conceptualization of race and the range of measures and dimensionality of race. This meta-analysis and focused discussion about the multi-dimensionality bases of race can be characterized by an excerpt from James (2001); "…there are those who study race and racial dynamics, and those who routinely use the concept of race in their studies. In the case of the former, …. RACE is seen as a profoundly social characteristic. The dynamism and fluidity of race is often used to better understand related social processes. ….. Racial delineations … result from historical patterns of racial hierarchy imbedded in ongoing interactions…. In the case of the latter, …. those who use race or ethnicity in their research, as opposed to those who study race, tend to treat it as a primordial or fixed characteristic. ….treat race as a function of fixed differences between 'populations'. ….race is conceptualized as a cause of myriad of social processes and distinctions" (James 2001, 246–47).

As contemporary scholars attempt to understand race as a lived experience, more generated research and discussions can serve to advance social science research so that studies of race became more comprehensive

(Ulmer, McFadden, and Nerenz 2009; Ver Ploeg and Perrin 2004). At the offset of this paper, I highlighted David Williams' (1994) review of race as a concept and measure(s) in a health journal. Health researchers have been paying more attention to the conceptualization and measurement of race (Cooper and David 1986; Jones, LaVeist, and Lillie-Blanton 1991; Miller 1987; Osborne and Feit 1992; Wilkinson and King 1987; Williams, Lavizzo-Mourey, and Warren 1994). In the conclusion section of Williams' article, he discusses how professional journals and their editors serve as active participants in the development of race and social sciences. He first suggests that editorials can educate the research community regarding appropriate and inappropriate uses of race. Second, since most researchers are responsive to directives from editors and editorial guidelines, their participation in research related discourse can affect current uses of the race construct. Third, minimally, editors can stipulate when researchers report whether race was assessed by respondent self-report, proxy report, extraction from records, or direct observation. Williams emphasized that in the studies reviewed, very few researchers bothered to specify how race was ascertained. Clarity and specificity of the meaning and choice of measure of race can have informative benefits to the researcher(s) as well as the readers. Finally, there is a need for more accurate definitions of racial and ethnic status as explanations for the differential impact of social phenomena and policy changes and system reform on population subgroups depends on these working definitions (Williams 1995, 269–71).

For example, in the case of Latinos, aspects such as birthplace, country of origin, recency of immigration, language facility, and acculturation become important characteristics that should be part of the habitually considered (Hayes-Bautista and Chapa 1987; Yankauer 1987). The understanding of race incorporates the historic and contemporary experiences of the particular population or group under study and places this social phenomenon in a larger context. We are starting to see more social science researchers factor in elements of a color-conscious society (Bonilla-Silva 2013; Telles, Flores, and Urrea-Giraldo 2015) via skin color and other phenotypical "characteristics." Darker skin color appears to have been established as a social characteristic predictive of opportunity structures and societal limitations.

In addition to analyzing the use of race in social science surveys, the results of the race project serve to accent the need for more thoughtful consideration of the conceptualization and measurement of race. The use of race primarily as a categorical variable in more or less an automatic

and a theoretical manner, or both, has real restrictions on our understanding and explanation of how racial differences are embedded into societal institutions and can serve only to extend the misrepresentation of social reality or lived experiences. The need for a careful, purposeful, theoretically informed clarification of race is a significant challenge for social science researchers. Race is a complex "assortment" of distinguishing histories and specific life situations that bear on access, opportunities, differential treatment, and self-worth, which affects many facets of a person's "lived experience" as well as societal relationships and policies.

The challenge for researchers lies with dealing directly with these complexities and more theoretically "rich" ways to conceptually "frame" race and develop more extensive measures. At the same time, adding complexity would require greater conceptual clarity of race and multiple measures. This could produce a tension between parsimony of items/measures and limitations of time and costs. Yet, this phenomenon is an ever present "task" of social science efforts to operationalize concepts into valid and reliable measures. A corollary to this challenge lies with use of appropriate analytical techniques to "capture" the multi-dimensional scope of race. For example, the application of multi-level (hierarchical) models requires the specification of predictor variables from a multiple levels (fixed effects) while denoting which variables and key interactions to include. In addition, there is a need for the specification of correlation among responses from shared clusters (random effects) (Gelman 2006). Components of the multi-levels of the social processes of race would include the individual, their household, their neighborhood, state and federal polices and other levels that influence race. The purpose of this paper is to account for the measures of race in major social science surveys in the context of theoretical conceptualization of race and challenges researchers to "capture" race in both its meanings and implications for individuals and groups in "everyday experiences."

Acknowledgments

The University of Michigan Small Grants program provided funds to underwrite the addition of University of New Mexico RW Johnson Center for Health Policy graduate students (i.e. Shannon Sanchez-Youngman, Vicki Ybarra, and Michael Mohammed). UNM faculty members Gabriel Sanchez and Jillian Medeiros assisted in the quality control of the coding protocols and studies. Additional coding assistance was possible through the University of Michigan's Undergraduate Research

Opportunity Program and placement of George Liu who worked two semesters on the coding of identified studies. Finally, ICPSR staff members, Sue Hodge, Abay Israel, Lynette Hoelter, and David Thomas, assisted the author in converting an excel database into a statistical software package for quantitative analysis. Finally, clarity and consistency are integral in communicating any research endeavor so that editorial assistance was provided by Nancy Ellsworth Garcia.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Ameena, Selina Mohammed, and David R. Williams. 2007. "Racial Discrimination and Health: Pathways and Evidence." *Indian Journal of Medical Research* **126**: 21–30.

Allen, Walter, Edward E. Telles, and Margaret Hunter. 2000. "Skin Color, Income, and Education: A Comparison of African Americans and Mexican Americans." *National Journal of Sociology* **12** (1): 129–80.

Anderson, Joanne. 2006. "Reflections on the Social Determinants of Women's Health-Explaining Interventions – Does Racialization Matters?" *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research* **38** (1): 7–14.

Arrighi, Barbara, ed. 2007. *Understanding Inequality: The Intersection of Race/Ethnicity, Class*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Banton, Michael. 1977. *The Idea of Race*. London: Tavistock.

Bashi, Vilma. 1999. "Racial Categories Matter Because Racial Hierarchies Matter: Commentary." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **21** (5) (September): 959–68.

Bates, Lisa M., Dolores Acevedo-Garcia, Margarita Alegría, and Nancy Krieger. 2008. "Immigration and Generational Trends in Body Mass Index and Obesity in the United States: Results of the National Latino and Asian American Survey, 2002–2003." *American Journal of Public Health* **98** (1): 70–7.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1999. "The Essential Social Fact of Race." *American Sociological Review* **64** (6): 899–906.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2004. "From Bi-Racial to Tri-Racial: Towards a New System of Racial Stratification in the USA." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **27** (6): 931–50.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2013. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. 4th ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Gianpalo Biaoccho. 2008. "Anything but Racism: How Sociologists Limit the Significance of Racism." In *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, eds. Tukufu Zuberi, and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. Lantham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Borrell, Luisa N., Catarina I. Kiefe, David R. Williams, Ana V. Diez-Roux, and Penny Gordon-Larsen. 2006. "Self-Reported Health, Perceived Racial Discrimination, and Skin Color in African Americans in the CARDIA Study." *Social Science and Medicine* **63**: 1415–27.

Bowman, Phillip J., Ray Muhammad, and Mosi Ifatunji. 2004. "Skin Tone, Class and Racial Attitudes among African-Americans." In *Skin Deep: How Race and Complexions Matter in the 'Color-Blind' Era*, ed. Cedric Herring. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 128–58.

Bratter, Jenifer L., and Bridget K. Gorman. 2011. "Does Multiracial Matter? A Study of Racial Disparities in Self-Rated Health." *Demography* **48**: 127–52.

Braveman, Paula. 2012. "Health Inequalities by Class and Race in the US: What Can We Learn from the Patterns?" *Social Science & Medicine* **74**: 665–67.

Browne, Irene, and Mary Odem. 2012. "Juan Crow in the Nuevo South? Racialization of Guatemalan and Dominican Immigrants in the Atlanta Metro Area." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* **9** (2): 321–37.
Bruch, Sarah, and Mara Loveman. 2011. "Measuring and Modeling Race as a Multi-Dimensional Construct: Evidence from Research on Racial Disparities in Education." Paper Presented at the Population Association of America Annual Meeting (April), Washington, DC.
Camara, Jules P. Harrell, Tanisha I. Burford, Brandi N. Cage, Travette McNair Nelson, Sheronda Shearon, Adrian Thompson, and Steven Green. 2011. "Multiple Pathways Linking Racism to Health Outcomes." *Du Bois Review* 8 (1): 143–57.
Cerulo, Karen A. 1997. "Identity Construction: New Issues, New Directions." *Annual Review of Sociology* **23**: 385–409.
Chae, David H., Amani M. Nuru-Jeter, Karen D. Lincoln and Darlene D. Francis. 2011. "Conceptualizing Racial Disparities in Health: Advancement of a Socio-Psychobiological Approach." *Du Bois Review* 8 (1): 63–77.
Chan, Joanna L., Alison Ehrlich, Reva C. Lawrence, Alan N. Moshell, Maria L. Turner, and Alexa Boer Kimball. 2005. "Assessing the Role of Race in Quantitative Measures of Skin Pigmentation and Clinical Assessments of Photosensitivity." *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology* **52** (4): 609–15.
Cobas, José A., Jorge Duany, and Joe R. Feagin. 2009. *How the United States Racializes Latinos: White Hegemony and Its Consequences*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
Cole, David. 1999. *No Equal Justice: Race and Class in the American Criminal Justice System*. New York: The New Press.
Cooper, Richard, and Richard David. 1986. "The Biological Concept of Race and Its Application to Public Health and Epidemiology." *Journal of Health Politics, Polity and Law* **11** (1): 97–116.
CQ Researcher (Corporate Author). 2014. *Issues in Race and Ethnicity*. 7th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
Dawson, Michael C. 1995. *Behind the Mule: Race, Class and African American Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefanic. 2013. "An Introduction to Critical Race Theory." In *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*. 3rd ed., eds. Michael Omni, and Howard Winant. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. pp. 1–18.
de la Puente, Manuel, and Ruth McKay. 1995. *Developing and Testing Race and Ethnic Origin Questions for the Current Population Survey Supplement on Race and Ethnic Origin*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
Dressler, William W., Kathryn S. Oths, and Clarence C. Gravlee. 2005. "Race and Ethnicity in Public Health Research: Models to Explain Health Disparities." *Annual Review of Anthropology* **34**: 231–52.
Espino, Rodolfo, and Michael M. Franz. 2002. "Latino Phenotypic Discrimination Revisited: The Impact of Skin Color on Occupational Prestige." *Social Science Quarterly* **83**: 612–23.
Espiritu, Yen Le 1992. *Asian American Pan-Ethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Fiscella, Kevin, Peter Franks, Mark P. Doescher, and Barry G. Saver. 2002. "Disparities in Health Care by Race, Ethnicity, and Language among the Insured: Findings from a National Sample." *Medical Care* **40** (1): 52–59.
Flores, Rene, and Edward Telles. 2012. "Social Stratification in Mexico: Disentangling Color, Ethnicity, and Class." *American Sociological Review* **77**: 486–94.
Ford, Marvella, and P. Adam Kelly. 2005. "Conceptualizing and Categorizing Race and Ethnicity in Health Services Research." *HSR: Health Services Research* **40** (5, part 2): 1658–75.

Frank, Reanne, Ilana Redstone Akresh, and Bo Lu. 2010. "Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order: How and Where Do They Fit In?" *American Sociological Review* **75**: 378–401.
Garcia, John A. 1991a. Report on the Latino National Political Survey and Construction of Race (Skin color) and Cultural Items.
Garcia, John A. 1991b. *Notes from the Training Session of Interviewers for the Latino National Political Survey*. Philadelphia, PA.
Garcia, John A. 2003. *Race/Ethnicity Identity Formation Patterns for Latinos in the 21st Century. Report to the Russel Sage Foundation*. New York.
Garcia, John A. 2009. "Examining Notions of Race among Latinos and the Intersection of Culture and Language." Pluralism in the Americas Conference. Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany.
Garcia, John A. 2013. "Toward a Holistic Conceptualization and Operationalization of Race and Health Disparities." In *Mapping 'Race': Critical Approaches to Health Disparities Research*, eds. Laura E. Gomez, and Nancy Lopez. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 188–209.
Garcia, John. A., Gabriel R. Sanchez, Shannon Sanchez-Youngman, Edward D. Vargas, and Vicki D. Ybarra. 2015. "Race as Lived Experience." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* **12** (2): 349–73.
Gee, Gilbert C., and Chandra L. Ford. 2011. "Structural Racism and Health Inequities: Old Issues, New Directions." *Du Bois Review* **8** (1): 115–32.
Gelman, Andrew. 2006. "Multi-level (Hierarchical) Modeling: What It Can and Cannot Do." *Technometrics* **48** (3) (August), 432–35.
Gravlee, Clarence C., William W. Dressler, and H. Russell Bernard. 2005. "Skin Color, Social Classification, and Blood Pressure in Southeastern Puerto Rico." *American Journal of Public Health* **95** (12): 2191–97.
Grieco, E. M., and Cassidy, Rachel C. 2001. "Overview of race and Hispanic origin, 2000" (Vol. 8, No. 2). US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau.
Grosofoguel, Ramon. 2004. "Race and Ethnicity as Racialized Ethnicities?: Identities within Global Coloniality." *Ethnicities* **4** (3): 315–36.
Hans, Valerie P., and Ramiro Martinez Jr. 1994. "Intersections of Race, Ethnicity, and the Law." *Cornell Law Faculty Publications* **18** (3): 211–21.
Harris, David, and Jeremiah Sim. 2002. "Who is Multi-Racial? Assessing the Complexity of Lived Race." *American Sociological Review* **67** (4): 614–27.
Harrell, Camara Jules P., Tanisha I. Burford, Brandi N. Cage, Travette McNair Nelson, Sheronda Shearon, Adrian Thompson, and Steven Green. 2011. "Multiple Pathways Linking Racism to Health Outcomes." *Du Bois Review* **8** (1): 143–57.
Hayes-Bautista, David E., and Jorge Chapa. 1987. "Latino Terminology: Conceptual Bases for Standardized Terminology." *American Journal of Public Health* **77** (January): 61–68.
Hersch, Joni. 2006. Skin Tone Effects among African Americans: Perceptions and Reality. Discussion Paper No. 545 Harvard Law School Cambridge, MA 02138.
Hill, Mark. 2002. "Race of the Interviewer and Perception of Skin Color: Evidence from the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality." *American Sociological Review* **66** (1): 99–108.
Hirschman, Charles, Richard Alba, and Reynolds Farley. 2000. "The Meaning and Measurement of Race in the U.S. Census: Glimpses into the Future." *Demography* **37** (3): 381–93.
Hochschild, Jennifer. 2011. "Including Oneself and Including Others: Who Belongs in My Country?" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **634**: 78–97.
Hochschild, Jennifer, and Vesla Weaver. 2007. "The Skin Color Paradox and the American Racial Order." *Social Forces* **86** (2): 643–70.

Humes, Karen, Nicholas A. Jones, and Roberto R. Ramirez. 2011. *Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin, 2010*. US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau.

Hunter, Margaret L. 1998. "Colorstruck: Skin Color Stratification in the Lives of African American Women." *Sociological Inquiry* **68** (4) (Fall): 517–35.

Hutchings, Vincent, Hakeem Jefferson, and Nicole Yadan. 2015. "The Color of our Skin and the Content of our Politics." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association; San Francisco, CA.

James, Angela. 2001. "Making Sense of Race and Racial Classification." *Race and Society* **4**: 235–47.

Johnson, Jacqueline. 2011. "Mass Incarceration: A Contemporary Mechanism of Racialization in the U.S." *Gonzaga Law Review* **47**: 301–18.

Jones, Camara, Benedict I. Truman, Laurie D. Elam-Evans, Clara A. Jones, Clara Y. Jones, Ruth Jiles, Susan F. Rumisha, and Geraldine S. Perry. 2008. "Using Socially Assigned Race to Probe White Advantages in Health Status." *Ethnicity and Disease* **18** (4) (Supplement): 1–12.

Jones, Camara P., Thomas A. LaVeist, and Marsha Lillie-Blanton. 1991. "Race in the Epidemiologic Literature: An Examination of the American Journal of Epidemiology, 192 1–1990." *American Journal of Epidemiology* **134** (10): 1079–84.

Keith, Verna M., and Cedric Herring. 1991. "Skin Tone and Stratification in the Black Community." *American Journal of Sociology* **97** (3): 760–778.

Keith, Verna M., Cedric Herring, Ann W. Nguyen, Robert Joseph Taylor, Linda M. Chatters, and Dawne M. Mouzon. 2017. "Microaggressions, Discrimination, and Phenotype among African Americans: A Latent Class Analysis of the Impact of Skin Tone and BMI." *Sociological Inquiry* **87** (2): 233–55.

Kinder, Donald R., and Lynn M. Sanders. 1996. *Divided by color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. University of Chicago Press.

King, Gary, and David R. Williams. 1995. "Race and Health: A Multi-Dimensional Approach to African American Health." In *Society and Health: Foundation for a Nation*, eds. Bejamin Amick, Sol Levine and Diana Chapman Walsh. New York: Oxford University Press, 93–130.

Krieger, Nancy, Stephen Sidney, and Eugenie Coakley. 1998. "Racial Discrimination and Skin Color in the CARDIA Study: Implications for Public Health Research." *American Journal of Public Health* **88**: 1308–13.

Krysan, Maria, and Amanda Lewis. 2004. *The Changing Terrain of Race and Ethnicity*. New York: Russell Sage.

LaVeist, Thomas. 1994. "Beyond Dummy Variables and Sample Selection: What Health Services Researchers Ought to Know about Race as a Variable." *Health Services Report* **29** (1): 1–16.

Lawrence, Keith, Stacey Sutton, Anne Kubisch, and Karen Fulbright-Anderson. 2004. *Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change: Structural Racism and Community Building*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Lee, Taeku, and Efrén O. Pérez. 2014. "The Persistent Connection Between Language-of-Interview and Latino Political Opinion." *Political Behavior* **36** (2): 401–25.

Lin, Scarlett S., and Jennifer L. Kelsey. 2000. "Use of Race and Ethnicity in Epidemiologic Research: Concepts, Methodological Issues, and Suggestions for Research." *Epidemiologic Reviews* **22** (2): 187–202.

Logan, John R. 2003. *How Race Counts for Hispanic Americans*. Albany: State University of New York, New York: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research.

Lopez, Alejandra M. 2003. "Collecting and Tabulating Race/Ethnicity Data with Diverse and Mixed Heritage Populations: A Case-Study with U.S. High School Students." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **26** (5): 931–61.
López, Nancy. 2017. "The Distinction Between Race and Ethnic Origin Is Real: Why We Need to Retain Hispanic Origin and Race as Separate Questions for the 2020 Census and Ethical Civil Rights Policy." Scholars Strategy Network Research Brief # 1 (Updated 3/1/17).
López, Nancy, and Laura Gomez, eds. 2013. *Mapping Race: Critical Approaches to Health Disparities Research*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Massey, Douglas, and Nancy A. Denton. 1989. "Racial Identity among Caribbean Hispanics: The Effect of Double Minority Status on Residential Segregation." *American Sociological Review* **54**: 790–808.
Massey, Douglas S, and Jennifer A. Martin. 2003. *NIS Skin Color Scale: The New Immigrant Survey Measured Respondent Skin Color Using a Scale* (Designed by based on an idea originally developed by Massey, Charles, Lundy, and Fischer) Princeton University; Office of Population Research.
Masuoka, Natalie. 2006. "Together they Become One: Examining the Predictors of Pan-ethnic Group Consciousness among Asian Americans and Latinos." *Social Science Quarterly* **87** (5): 993–1011.
Masuoka, Natalie. 2008. "Political Attitudes and Ideologies of Multiracial Americans: The Implications of Mixed Race in the United States." *Political Research Quarterly* **61**: 253.
McClain, Paula D., and Joseph Stewart Jr. 2013. *"Can We All Get Along?": Racial and Ethnic Minorities in American Politics*. 6th ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
McGovern, Jen. 2017. "The Boundaries of Latino Sport Leadership: How Skin Tone, Ethnicity, and Nationality Construct Baseball's Color Line." *Sociological Inquiry* **87** (1) (February): 49–74.
McKay, Ruth B., Linda L. Stinson, Manuel de la Puente, and Brian A. Kojetin. 1996. *Interpreting the Findings of the Statistical Analysis of the CPS Supplement on Race and Ethnicity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
McIntosh, Peggy. 1988. "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies." Working Paper 189, *Wellesley Centers for Women*, Wellesley, MA.
Miles, Robert. 1993. *Racisms After 'Race Relations'*. London: Routledge.
Miller, Seymour M. 1987. "Race in the Health of America." *The Milbank Quarterly* **65** (Supplement 2): 500–31.
Montague, Ashley. 1962. "The Concept of Race." *American Anthropologist* (New Series) **64** (5-1): 919–28.
Montalvo, Frank F., and G. Edward Codina. 2001. "Skin Color and Latinos in the United States." *Ethnicities* **1** (September): 321–41.
Morales, Maria Christina. 2008. "The Ethnic Niche as an Economic Pathway for the Dark Skinned Labor Market Incorporation of Latina/o Workers." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* **30** (3): 280–98.
Murguía, Edward, and Edward E. Telles. 1996. "Phenotype and Schooling among Mexican Americans." *Sociology of Education* **69** (October): 276–89.
Office of Management and Budget. 1997. "Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity." *Federal Register* (notice, October 30).
Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From 1960s to 1990s*. New York: Routledge.
Osborne, Newton G., and Marvin D. Feit. 1992. "The Use of Race in Medical Research." *Journal of the American Medical Association* **267** (January): 275–79.
Owens, Dawn, Timothy Robinson, and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 2010. "Three Faces of Identity." *Annual Review Sociology* **36**: 477–99.

Paradies, Yin. 2006. "A Systematic Review of Empirical Research on Self-reported Racism and Health." *International Journal of Epidemiology* **35** (4): 888–901.
Perreira, Krista, and Edward Telles. 2014. "The Color of Health: Color, Racial Classification and Discrimination in Health of Latin Americans." *Social Science and Medicine* **116**: 241–50.
Prewitt, Kenneth. 2005. "Racial Classification in America: Where Do We Go from Here?" *Dædalus* **134** (1) (Winter): 5–17.
Sanchez, Gabriel. 2006. "The Role of Group Consciousness in Latino Public Opinion." *Political Research Quarterly* **59**: 433–46.
Sanchez, Gabriel R., and Vickie D. Ybarra. 2013. "New Approaches to the Study of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities: Advocating Better Measures and Exploration of Internal Variation within Diverse Groups." In *Mapping 'Race': Critical Approaches to Health Disparities Research*, eds. Laura E. Gomez, and Nancy Lopez. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, pp. 104–16.
Saperstein, Aliya. 2006. "Double Checking the Race Box: Examining Inconsistency between Survey Measures of Observed Race and Self-Reported Race." *Social Forces* **85** (1): 57–74.
Saperstein, Aliya. 2012. "Capturing Complexity in the United States: Which Aspects of Race Matters and When?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **35** (8) (August): 1484–502.
Saperstein, Aliya. 2013. "Representing the Multi-dimensionality of Race in Survey Research." In *Mapping 'Race': Critical Approaches to Health Disparities Research*, eds. Laura E. Gomez, and Nancy Lopez. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 167–87.
Saperstein, Aliya, and Andrew Penner. 2012. "Racial Fluidity and Inequality in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* **118** (3): 676–727.
Saperstein, Aliya, Andrew Penner, and Ryan Light. 2013. "Racial Formation in Perspective: Connecting Individuals, Institutions and Power Relations." *Annual Review of Sociology* **39**: 359–78.
Selod, Scher, and David Embrick. 2013. "Racialization and Muslims: Situating the Muslim Experience." *Sociological Compass* **7/7**: 644–55.
Shariff-Marco, Salma, Nancy Breen, Hope Landrine, Bryce B. Reeve, Nancy Krieger, Gilbert C. Gee, David R. Williams, Vickie M. Mays, Ninez A. Ponce, and Margarita Alegría. 2011. "Measuring Everyday Racial/Ethnic Discrimination in Health Surveys: How Best to Ask the Questions, in One or Two Stages, across Multiple Racial/Ethnic Groups?" *Du Bois Review* **8** (1): 159–77.
Simms, Margaret, and Elaine Waxman. 2016. *To Talk about Structural Racism, We Have to Talk about White Privilege*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
Snipp, C. Matthew. 2003. "Racial Measurement in the American Census: Past Practices and Implications for the Future." *Annual Review of Sociology* **29**: 563–88.
Tafoya, Sonya. 2004. *Shades of Belonging*. Pew Hispanic Report. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
Telles, Edward, Rene D. Flores, and Fernando Urrea-Giraldo. 2015. "Pigmentrocracies in Eight Latin American Countries." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* **40**: 39–58.
Telles, Edward E., and Edward Murguia. 1990. "Phenotypic Discrimination and Income Differences among Mexican Americans." *Social Science Quarterly* **71** (4): 682–96.
Terkildsen, Nayda, and David Damore. 1999. "The Dynamics of Racialized Media Coverage in Congressional Elections." *Journal of Politics* **61** (3): 680–99.
Tucker, Clyde, and Brian Kojetin. 1996. "Testing Racial and Ethnic Origin Questions in the CPS supplement." *Monthly Labor Review* **119**: 3.

Uhlmann, Eric, Nilanjana Dasgupta, Angelica Elgueta, Anthony G. Greenwald, and Jane Swanson. 2002. "Subgroup Prejudice Based on Skin Color among Hispanics in the United States and Latin America." *Social Cognition* **20** (3): 198–225.
Ulmer, Cheryl, Bernadette McFadden, and David Nerenz, eds. 2009. *Race, Ethnicity, and Language Data: Standardization for Health Care Quality Improvement* (Institute of Medicine). Washington, DC: National Academies of Sciences.
U.S. Bureau of the Census (Prepared by Kelly Matthews, Jessica Phelen, Nicolas Jones, Sarah Konya, Rachel Marks, Beverly Pratt, Julia combs, and Michael Bentley. 2017. *The 2015 National Content Test: Race and Ethnicity Analysis Report*. Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.
Vargas, Edward D., Nadia C. Winston, John A. Garcia, and Gabriel R. Sanchez. 2016. "Latina/o or Mexicana/o? The Relationship between Socially Assigned Race and Experiences with Discrimination." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* **2** (4): 498–515.
Ver Ploeg, Michele, and Edward Perrin, eds. 2004. *Eliminating Health Disparities: Measurement and Data Needs*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
Vidal-Ortiz, Salvador. 2004. "On Being a White Person of Color: Using Auto-ethnography to Understand Puerto Rican Racialization." *Qualitative Sociology* **27** (2) (Summer): 179–84.
Viruell-Fuentes, Edna A. 2011. "'It's a Lot of Work': Racialization Processes, Ethnic Identity Formations, and Their Health Implications." *Du Bois Review* 8 (1): 37–52.
Wilkinson, Doris Y., and Gary King. 1987. "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in the Use of Race as a Variable: Policy Implications." *The Milbank Quarterly* **65** (Supplement 1): 56–71.
Williams, David R. 1994. "The Concept of Race in Health Services Research: 1966 to 1990." *HSR: Health Services Research* **29** (3) (August): 261–74.
Williams, David R. and Chiquita Collins. 1995. "U.S. Socioeconomic and Racial Differences in Health: Patterns and Explanations." *Annual Review of Sociology* **21**: 349–86.
Williams, David R. 1997. "Race and Health: Basic Questions, Emerging Directions." *Annals of Epidemiology* **7** (5): 322–33.
Williams, David R. 1999. "Race and Socioeconomic Status: The Added Effects of Racism and Discrimination." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **896**: 173–88.
Williams, David R., Risa Lavizzo-Mourey, and Rueben C. Warren. 1994. "The Concept of Race and Health Status in America." *Public Health Reports* **109** (1) (January–February): 26–41.
Williams, David R., and Selina A. Mohammed. 2009. "Discrimination and Racial Disparities in Health: Evidence and Needed Research." *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* **32**: 20–47.
Williams, David, Selina A. Mohammed, Jacinta Leavell, and Chiquita Collins. 2010. "Race, Socioeconomic Status and Health: Complexities, Ongoing Challenges and Research Opportunities." *Annual Review of New York Academy of Science* **1186**: 69–101.
Williams, David R., and Selina A. Mohammed. 2013. "Racism and Health I: Pathways and Scientific Evidence." *American Behavioral Scientist* **57** (8): 1152–73.
Woo, Meghan, S. Austin, D. Williams, and Gary Bennett. 2011. "Reconceptualizing the Measurement of Multi-racial Status for Health Research in the United States." *Du Bois Review* 8: 25–36.
Yankauer, Alfred. 1987. "Hispanic/Latino-What's in a Name?" *American Journal of Public Health* **77** (1): 15–17.
Zuberi, Tukufu. 2001. *Thicker than Blood*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Zuberi, Tukufu, Evelyn J. Patterson, and Quincy Thomas Stewart. 2015. "Race, Methodology, and Social Construction in the Genomic Era." *ANNALS, AAPSS* **661** (September): 109–27.

APPENDIX

List of Included ICPSR Studies—Race Project

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
34565.0	Abuse Warning Network (DAWN), 2011
3083.0	Alameda County [California] Health and Ways of Living Study, 1994 and 1995 Panels
4432.0	Alameda County [California] Health and Ways of Living Study, 1999 Panel
7714.0	Alaska Plea Bargaining Study, 1974–1976
3088.0	Alcohol and Drug Services Study (ADSS), 1996–1999
4117.0	American Community Survey (ACS): Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), 2003
29263.0	American Community Survey (ACS): Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), 2008
6954.0	American Housing Survey, 1994: MSA Core and Supplement File
28821.0	American Mosaic Project Survey, 2003
29182.0	American National Election Studies (ANES) Panel Study, 2008–2009
8475.0	American National Election Studies (ANES) Cumulative Data File, 1948–2008
4294.0	American National Election Study, 2004: Contextual File
7212.0	American National Election Study, 1948
4639.0	American Terrorism Study, 1980–2002
24943.0	American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003–2008, Multi-Year Data
7948.0	Americans View Their Mental Health, 1976
9016.0	Annual Housing Survey, 1980 [United States]: National Core File
4592.0	American Housing Survey, 2004: Metropolitan Microdata
28281.0	Annual Survey of Jails: Jail-Level Data, 2008
6395.0	Annual Survey of Jails: Jurisdiction-Level and Jail-Level Data, 1992
34300.0	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) Asthma Call-Back Survey, 2009
34085.0	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2003
4028.0	Black American Perspectives [United States]: The Future of Civil Rights, November 11–25, 1991
3671.0	Bridged Race 2000; and 2001; Population Estimates for Calculating Vital Rates [United States]
4187.0	California Special Election Exit Poll and Phone Survey, 2003
3482.0	California Vital Statistics and Homicide Data, 1990–1999
7501.0	Carnegie Commission National Survey of Higher Education: Faculty Study, 1969

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
9445.0	Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities, 1988–1989 [United States]
6491.0	Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities, 1992–1993 [United States]
6953.0	Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities, 1995
27681.0	Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA), 2008
27262.0	Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Training Academies, 2006 [United States]
3370.0	Changing Lives of Older Couples (CLOC): A Study of Spousal Bereavement in the Detroit Area, 1987–1993
20352.0	Characteristics of Arrestees at Risk for Co-Existing Substance Abuse and Mental Disorder in Cleveland, Ohio, 2003
31142.0	Chicago Community Adult Health Study, 2001–2003
8218.0	Chicago Lawyers Survey, 1975
34303.0	Chicago Male Drug Use and Health Survey (MSM Supplement), 2002–2003
3002.0	Chicago Women's Health Risk Study, 1995–1998
34696.0	Child Care and Development Fund Administrative Data, Federal Fiscal Year 2010
20520.0	Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), 1991–2006
3548.0	Childhood Victimization and Delinquency, Adult Criminality, and Violent Criminal Behavior in a Large Urban County in the Northwest United States, 1980–1997
7340.0	Citizen Attitude Survey: Urban Problems in Ten American Cities, 1970
7201.0	Civic Culture Study, 1959–1960
3199.0	Community Tracking Study Household Survey, 1998–1999, and Followback Survey, 1998–2000: [United States]
4584.0	Community Tracking Study Physician Survey, 2004–2005: [United States]
4170.0	Compilation of Afrobarometer Round I Survey in 12; Countries: Botswana, Ghana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Namibia, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, 1999–2001
22001.0	Consumer Expenditure Survey, 2006: Interview Survey and Detailed Expenditure Files
8598.0	Consumer Expenditure Survey, 1982–1983: Interview Survey
2399.0	Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) [United States]: Freshman Survey, 1969
2411.0	Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) [United States]: Freshman Survey, 1977

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
2419.0	Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) [United States]: Freshman Survey, 1985
8367.0	Convention Delegate Study, 1980 [United States]
3023.0	Cooperative Agreement for AIDS Community-Based Outreach/ Intervention Research Program, 1992–1998: [United States]
20660.0	County Characteristics, 2000–2007 [United States]
27062.0	Crime during the Transition to Adulthood: How Youth Fare As They Leave Out-of-Home Care in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin, 2002–2007
27781.0	Criminal Recidivism in a Large Cohort of Offenders Released from Prison in Florida, 2004–2008
2743.0	Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Community Safety in 12; United States Cities, 1998
60.0	Current Population Survey: Voter Supplement File, 1972
8457.0	Current Population Survey: Voter Supplement File, 1984
3967.0	Current Population Survey, November 2002: Voting and Registration Supplement
3182.0	Current Population Survey, November 2000: Voting and Registration Supplement
8707.0	Current Population Survey: Voter Supplement File, 1986
21340.0	Current Population Survey, November 2006: Voting and Registration Supplement
25643.0	Current Population Survey, November 2008: Voting and Registration Supplement
31082.0	Current Population Survey, November 2010: Voting and Registration Supplement
4312.0	Current Population Survey: Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) Survey, 2005
29642.0	Current Population Survey: Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) Supplement Survey, 2009
21320.0	Current Population Survey, October 2006: School Enrollment Supplement
31541.0	Current Population Survey, October 2010: School Enrollment and Internet Use Supplement
26441.0	Data-Driven Supervision Protocols for Positive Parole Outcomes in Georgia, 2007–2008
4413.0	Detroit Arab American Study (DAAS), 2003
7407.0	Detroit Area Study, 1969: White Attitudes and Actions on Urban Problems
7908.0	Detroit Area Study, 1975: A Study of Community Life and Politics
23820.0	Detroit Area Study, 2004

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
26261.0	Detroit Area Study, 1998: Whit Racial Ideology
6410.0	Detroit Area Study, 1989: Political Participation in the Detroit Area
7324.0	Detroit Area Study, 1968: Black Attitudes in Detroit
7407.0	Detroit Area Study, 1969: White Attitudes and Actions on Urban Problems
8189.0	Detroit Area Study, 1977: Attitude-Behavior Consistency and Attribution of Responsibility
33041.0	Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN), 2004
9305.0	Detroit Area Study, 1983: Attitudes and Experiences in Detroit
3272.0	Detroit Area Study, 1995: Social Influence on Health: Stress, Racism, and Health Protective Resources
21174.0	Developing and Validating a Brief Jail Mental Health Screen in Maryland and New York, 2005–2006
28061.0	Early Childhood Longitudinal Study: Birth Cohort, 2001–2002, 2-year Data
3676.0	Early Childhood Longitudinal Study: Kindergarten Class of 1998–1999
4275.0	Education Longitudinal Study (ELS), 2002: Base Year
7297.0	Eight City Study of Child Political Socialization, 1961–1962
24761.0	Epidemiology of Depression and Help-Seeking Behavior, 1979–1983, Los Angeles, California
9594.0	Ethnicity and Homicide in California, 1850–1900
8451.0	Executions in the United States, 1608–2002: The ESPY File
21187.0	Exploring the Drugs-Crime Connection within the Electronic Dance Music and Hip Hop Nightclub Scenes in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2005–2006
7877.0	Energy Crisis Attitudes and Conservation Behavior in the United States, April–May 1980
6389.0	Equality of Educational Opportunity (COLEMAN) Study (EEOS), 1966
2372.0	Estimates of the Population of Counties by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin [United States]: 1990–1996
4556.0	Ethno-Methodological Study of the Subculture of Prison Inmate Sexuality in the United States, 2004–2005
3542.0	Evaluating a Collaborative Intervention between Health Care and Criminal Justice in Harris County, Texas, 2001–2002
20461.0	Evaluating the Impact of a Specialized Domestic Violence Police Unit in Charlotte, North Carolina, 2003–2005
21640.0	Evaluation of Children's Futures: Improving Health and Development Outcomes for Children in Trenton, New Jersey, 2001–2005

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
22660.0	Evaluation of Gender Violence and Harassment Prevention Programs in Middle Schools in Cleveland, Ohio, 2006–2007 [United States]
3400.0	Evaluation of Law Enforcement Training for Domestic Violence Cases in a Southwestern City in Texas, 1997–1999
3319.0	Evaluation of No-Drop Policies for Domestic Violence Cases in San Diego, California, Omaha, Nebraska, Klamath Falls, Oregon, and Everett, Washington, 1996–2000
7710.0	Evaluation of Pre-Trial Settlement Conference: Dade County, Florida, Criminal Court, 1979
3017.0	Evaluation of Victim Advocacy Services for Battered Women in Detroit, 1998–1999
3488.0	Evaluation of a Centralized Response to Domestic Violence by the San Diego County Sheriff's Department Domestic Violence Unit, 1998–1999
4686.0	Evaluation of the Agriculture Crime Technology Information and Operation Network (ACTION) in Nine Counties in California, 2004–2005
33861.0	Firearm Injury Surveillance Study, 1993–2010
31622.0	Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study [Public Use Data]
34375.0	Gates Millennium Scholars Program (GMS) Cohort 1, 2000–2008
22747.0	Gateways and Pathways Project (GAPP) 1997–2000, St. Louis, Missouri
27521.0	Gender, Mental Illness, and Crime in the United States, 2004
31521.0	General Social Survey, 1972–2010 (Cumulative File)
26301.0	Global Views 2008: American Public Opinion and Foreign Policy
7326.0	Harris 1972; American Women's Opinion Poll
7839.0	Health Interview Survey, 1977
2851.0	Hispanic Established Populations for the Epidemiologic Studies of the Elderly, 1993–1994: [Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas]
4291.0	Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study, 2001
22140.0	HIV Transmission Network Metastudy Project: An Archive of Data from Eight Network Studies, 1988–2001
3522.0	Health Behavior in School-Aged Children, 1997–1998 [United States]
4372.0	Health Behavior in School-Aged Children, 2001–2002 [United States]
28241.0	Health Behavior in School-Aged Children (HBSC), 2005–2006
24382.0	Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS), 2003
27202.0	Health Tracking Physician Survey, 2008

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
2081.0	Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) I: Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1, 1965 and June 30, 1966
2138.0	Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) VI: Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1, 1970, and June 30, 1971
2071.0	Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) XX: Fall Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education, 1985
30103.0	How Couples Meet and Stay Together (HCMST), Wave I 2009, Wave II 2010, Wave III 2011, United States
22627.0	Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA), 2004
30302.0	Immigrant Second Generation in Metropolitan New York
26601.0	Impact Evaluation of Youth Crime Watch Programs in Three Florida School Districts, 1997–2007
3382.0	Impact Evaluation of the Felony Domestic Violence Court in Kings County [Brooklyn], New York, 1994–2000
20347.0	Impact of Institutional Placement on the Recidivism of Delinquent Youth in New York City, 2000–2003
9418.0	Impact of Victimization in the Lives of Incarcerated Women in South Carolina, 2000–2002
4221.0	Independent Regulatory Commissioner Database, 1887–2000
30.0	Indiana Voter: Nineteenth Century Rural Bases of Partisanship, 1870
3094.0	Images of Aging in America, 1994
26344.0	Integrated Fertility Survey Series, Release 7, 1955–2002 [United States]
9257.0	Intersection of Personal and National History, 1985
6232.0	Jury Verdicts Database for Cook County, Illinois, and All Counties in California, 1960–1984
3750.0	Juvenile Defendants in Criminal Courts (JDCC): Survey of 40 Counties in the United States, 1998
8495.0	Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census, 1984–1985
24502.0	Latino National Survey (LNS)—New England, 2006
6841.0	Latino National Political Survey, 1989–1990
2052.0	Latino National Survey, 2005–2006
31161.0	Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS), 2007
3565.0	Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS): 2000 Sample Survey of Law Enforcement Agencies
30263.0	Longitudinal Study of American Youth, 1987–1994 and 2007
30263.0	Longitudinal Study of American Youth, 1987–1994 and 2007

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
29582.0	Marriage Matters Panel Survey of Newlywed Couples, 1998–2004, Louisiana
2163.0	Marital Instability over the Life Course [United States]: A Five-Wave Panel Study, 1980, 1983, 1988, 1992–1994, 1997
3812.0	Marital Instability over the Life Course [United States]: A Six-Wave Panel Study, 1980, 1983, 1988, 1992–1994, 1997, 2000
31322.0	Married and Cohabiting Couples, 2010
8050.0	Media Crime Prevention Campaign in the United States, 1980
2856.0	Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS): Survey of Minority Groups [Chicago and New York City], 1995–1996
22840.0	Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS II): Milwaukee African American Sample, 2005–2006
30984.0	Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of American Youth (8th- and 10th-Grade Surveys), 2010
25382.0	Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of American Youth (12th-Grade Survey), 2008
6227.0	Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1976–1992
8224.0	Mortality Detail File: External Cause Extract, 1968–1978, 1979–1980
3874.0	Mortality Detail and Multiple Cause of Death, 1981
2535.0	Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, 1992–1994: [Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles]
3905.0	Multiple Cause of Death, 1968–1973
2702.0	Multiple Cause of Death, 1996
22040.0	Multiple Causes of Death Public Use Files, 2005
3906.0	Multiple Cause of Death, 1974–1978
2029.0	National Black Election Study, 1996
4449.0	National Crime Victimization Survey: Unbounded Data, 2004
28543.0	National Crime Victimization Survey, 2009
4146.0	National Drug Abuse Treatment System Survey, Waves II–IV
35060.0	National Election Pool General Election Exit Polls, 2006
4712.0	National Head Start/Public School Early Childhood Transition Demonstration Study, 1991–1999
8055.0	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey I, 1971–1975: Medical Examination
6733.0	National Home and Hospice Care Survey, 1994
28961.0	National Home and Hospice Care Survey, 2007
3763.0	National Home and Hospice Care Survey, 1998
3607.0	National Household Education Survey, 1999
00191.0	National Latino and Asian American Study, 2002–2003
3959.0	National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1997

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
3927.0	National Survey of America's Families (NSAF), 1999
4582.0	National Survey of America's Families (NSAF), 2002
27121.0	National Survey of American Life Self-Administered Questionnaire (NSAL-SAQ), February 2001–June 2003
8512.0	National Survey of Black Americans, 1979–1980
4652.0	National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS II), 2004–2006
8424.0	National Youth Survey [United States]: Wave II, 1977
6542.0	National Youth Survey [United States]: Wave VII, 1987
27364.0	New York City Community Health Survey, 2008
27064.0	New York City Community Health Survey, 2002
21180.0	Northwest Area Foundation Ventures Social Indicators Survey, June–September 2005
3832.0	Pilot National Asian American Political Survey, 2000–2001
3576.0	Reports of the American Indian Family History Project, 1885–1930
7682.0	Residential Neighborhood Crime Control Project: Hartford, Connecticut, 1973, 1975–1977, 1979
3253.0	Resources for Enhancing Alzheimer's Caregiver Health, 1996–2001
4354.0	Resources for Enhancing Alzheimer's Caregiver Health (REACH II), 2001–2004
22220.0	Retention Challenges for HIV-Infected Primary Care Patients, 2001–2004 [United States]
7683.0	Retirement History Longitudinal Survey, 1969
7739.0	Retirement History Longitudinal Survey, 1969–1973, and Summary of Social Security Earnings: Merged Data
25928.0	Risk Assessment and Schemes for Sexual Recidivism: A 25 Year Follow-Up of Convicted Sex Offenders Referred to the Massachusetts Treatment Center, 1959–1984
3052.0	Risk Factors for Violent Victimization of Women in a Major Northeastern City, 1990–1991 and 1996–1997
3142.0	Role of Stalking in Domestic Violence Crime Reports Generated by the Colorado Springs Police Department, 1998
3356.0	SETUPS: Voting Behavior: The 2000 Election
8281.0	State Party Organizations, 1960–1980 [United States]
7694.0	Status of the Elderly, 1972
7370.0	Student Achievement Study, 1970–1974
4583.0	Supervised and Unsupervised Parental Access in Domestic Violence Cases in New York City, New York, 2002–2005
2039.0	Survey of Adults on Probation, 1995 [United States]
4381.0	Survey of Community, Crime, and Health, 1995, 1998 [United States]

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
62449.0	Surveys of Consumers, August 2003
8799.0	Survey of Consumer Attitudes and Behavior, December 1983
3602.0	Survey of Consumer Attitudes and Behavior, Spring 1957
4387.0	Survey of Consumer Attitudes and Behavior, April 1997
9034.0	Survey of Consumer Expenditures, 1972–1973
7741.0	Survey of Health Services Utilization and Expenditures, 1963
7740.0	Survey of Health Services Utilization and Expenditures, 1970
4637.0	Survey of Holt Adoptees and Their Families, 2005
4517.0	Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) 2004 Panel
4359.0	Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 2002 [United States]
7811.0	Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities and Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities, 1974
6068.0	Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, 1991 [United States]
7668.0	Survey of Jail Inmates, 1972
7661.0	Survey of Low Income Aged and Disabled, 1973–1974
4297.0	Survey of Texas Adults, 2004
7570.0	Survey of United States Congressional Candidates, 1976
20341.0	Testing the Efficacy of the SANE-SART Programs in Kansas, Massachusetts, and New Jersey, 1997–2001
28501.0	The 1915 Iowa State Census Project
4549.0	The 500 Family Study, 1998–2000 [United States]
8354.0	The Evangelical Voter in the United States, 1983
28481.0	The Mexican American Study Project II (MASP II), 1998–2000
4679.0	Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS): Wave 1, 2001
4605.0	Transatlantic Trends Survey, 2005
7874.0	Transitional Aid Research Project (TARP), 1976–1977
25948.0	Trends in Occupational Sex and Race Composition, 1970, 1980, 1990 [United States]
30770.0	Uniform Crime Reporting: National Incident-Based Reporting System, 2009
4607.0	United States Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) Survey, 2006
6948.0	Vital Statistics: Marriage Detail, 1990 [United States]
24661.0	Voice of the People Millennium Survey, 2000
3809.0	Voter News Service General Election Exit Poll, 2002
6520.0	Voter News Service General Election Exit Polls, 1994
6989.0	Voter News Service General Election Exit Polls, 1996
6102.0	Voter Research and Surveys General Election Exit Polls, 1992
6248.0	Voter Research and Surveys New Jersey Gubernatorial Election Exit Poll, 1993

Continued

Appendix. Continued

ICPSR study number	Name of study and time period
2347.0	Washington, DC, Metropolitan Area Drug Study (DC*MADS), 1992: Drug Use among DC Women Delivering Live Births in DC Hospitals
2958.0	Women and Violence in Chicago, Illinois, 1994–1995