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A fundamental tension lies at the heart of the social science data archiving mission. On the one hand, the goal is to maximize access. Data are collected, prepared, and preserved in their fullest form, to facilitate and inform research projects in the future. On the other hand, confidentiality of respondent information must be addressed. Both the summary data and the microdata may contain sensitive information that must be protected, often by “blurring” the data to reduce the probability of reidentification of individuals. This dilemma has become more complex in recent years as the technology has advanced and public perceptions have altered. The basic question is: How can we minimize the loss of information that attends the process of protecting confidentiality?
Background

Data dissemination and data preservation have always been the two major tasks performed by social science data archives. Until only about ten years ago, both tasks used similar technologies, relying on removable media such as magnetic tapes and CD-ROMs. These media diverged, however, when computer networks were developed that allowed data archives to deliver large files through FTP servers and small files by simple e-mail transactions.

Yet, while the Internet has become an excellent avenue for information transfer and data dissemination, it is certainly an unsafe chest for preservation. Web sites emerge, change, move, and vanish overnight. Even when they are still active, their contents may easily be altered, leaving no trace of yesterday’s information. Thus, the Internet dissemination capabilities have outpaced the current technologies for preservation.

This inequity has some important effects on both data archiving and dissemination:

• Many government and academic data producers create and maintain elaborate Web sites loaded with statistics. Quite a few of them include microdata public use files (PUF) as well. Such activity is rarely accompanied by a preservation policy.

• In the interest of confidentiality, data producers perform further modifications to the microdata in the process of disclosure control, and then it is the reduced microdata that are disseminated and preserved.

• Rising demands of users and growing competition on the Web push data archives to invest more resources in Web-based dissemination systems. This constructive development, however, may diminish the attention paid to preserving the data.

The Current Setup

Preparing a dataset for public release frequently involves extensive removal, recoding, or masking of variables, as can be seen from the examples in Tables 1 and 2. Obviously, such reduced datasets might meet the needs of an undergraduate student or an interested citizen, but are often far from adequate for the needs and methods of deep scientific research.

Data producers perform these and other disclosure control modifications to create a PUF, which is then deposited in a data archive for preservation and dissemination. Meanwhile, the full detailed data (FDD)—the original microdata with only the direct identifiers removed—remains in the producer’s possession. Since data producers are naturally busy with other projects, preservation procedures may be neglected or inadequately performed. At the same time, the life span of such files becomes shorter than ever as information technology speeds up changes of media and formats, leading to a permanent loss of information.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>VAR. TYPE</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCTINCX</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: N/A

Of your total income from your practice during calendar year 1997, approximately what percent would you estimate was earned in the form of bonuses, returned withholds, or other incentive payments based on your performance?

Description: Percent of 1997 income from bonuses, returned withholds, or other incentive payments based on physician’s performance. Constructed from responses to questions H9 and H9a. An edit was performed on this variable so that it does not apply for physicians who are not eligible for bonuses (H9a/EBONUS=0). Values were top coded at 40% for confidentiality reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>CUMUL.</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUMPCT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–39%</td>
<td>4,184</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% (top code)</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>6,644</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-9: Not ascertained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,645</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1: Inapplicable</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>12,304</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of income has been recoded into four categories: 0, 1, 2–39, and 40+. The 2–39% category includes 63% of the applicable cases. From ICPSR 3267: Community Tracking Study Physician Survey, 1998–1999.
Yet, it is possible to implement a better strategy for protecting confidentiality. Recognizing the significance of preservation, some data producers are now handing over detailed datasets to a data archive, authorizing the archive to check the data for risks of disclosure and to perform the necessary data modifications. These modifications may be guided either by the producer’s instructions or by the archive’s disclosure control policy. The resulting PUF may be identical to that prepared by the producer, but the FDD is preserved for the future and may be used in new ways. It can be made available as a restricted file that can be requested by authorized users under a special contract. It may also be used to prepare different versions of the PUF or to reindex classifications. Having the original unedited file also means that in the future it may be accessible through new methods of protecting confidentiality as they develop.

Another Approach

This discussion does not address levels of security, nor does it evaluate methods of protecting confidentiality. These issues are well dealt with by national statistical agencies, by Institutional Review Boards (IRBs), and in many papers, books, and conferences. Though data archives do not play a central role in these discussions, they are fully committed to protecting the confidentiality of archived data and are aware that any violation or disclosure of private data may cause unpredictable damage to the future of social surveys as well as to secondary analysis of existing data. At the same time, data archives expect statisticians and policymakers to acknowledge the value of secondary analysis of public data both for social sciences and for policymaking. With these considerations in mind, data archives should approach data producers with a program that meets research and preservation tasks while safeguarding data confidentiality.

One option is to prepare multiple PUF versions, with each version hiding a few sensitive variables while exposing others, and with each version intended for a different set of users and research questions. For example, the U.S. Census 1% Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) might be released in two forms:

- A geographical version that exposes medium size geographic location and hides other variables such as detailed occupation, industry, age, and income.
- A demographic-economic version that masks geographic identifiers but leaves all other characteristics of households and individuals.

Such a multiple-version technique is already implemented in Israel by the Central Bureau of Statistics in collaboration with the Social Sciences Data Center. This approach repre-

---

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65 and older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTIES:**
Data type: numeric
Missing-data codes: *--1
Record/columns: 1/1185-1186

**A4_R: Race, Grouped**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTIES:**
Data type: numeric
Missing-data codes: *--1
Record/columns: 1/1187-1188

On-line Disclosure Control

Current procedures for protecting confidentiality treat a dataset as if each user has access to all its parts, cases, and variables. In reality, however, this need not be the model that data archives follow. The required subset of data (cases \( \times \) variables) and the details of each variable should instead be determined by the proposed research question and the method of analysis. A user who wishes to investigate inequality of incomes probably needs continuous incomes in dollars, but might abandon other variables such as detailed country of birth and MSA. On the other hand, a user studying political attitudes may be satisfied with grouped income but needs detailed schooling and occupation measures. The most typical tradeoff is between geographic identifiers and other characteristics: planning authorities typically require geographical granularity, while academic research projects tend to insist on ungrouped economic and demographic variables.

The idea is for the user to define a subset and let a confidentiality clearance engine check the defined subset against a given level of security. If a subset is cleared for a given user, it is immediately available for download or for online analysis. Otherwise, the “high-risk” variables are displayed and the user is requested either to drop them or to let the system recode them. In the process of modifying the requested subset, the user who drops key or sensitive variables may add other “neutral” variables to “reimburse” her research plan. Once the user replies, the simulator runs again and displays updated results. This simulation process may present a considerable improvement over the single PUF practice, but its value to potential users still depends on the ability to forecast typical research questions related to the data. This method also puts a significant burden on the data archive, which has to preserve multiple versions rather than just one.

The Optimal Scenario

Another way to deal with statistical confidentiality in microdata is to move the disclosure control process out of the phase of preparing a dataset and place it instead at the point of data access, mainly through the Internet. A suggested model is based on five principles:

- Data producers authorize the data archive to perform disclosure control regarding indirect identifiers and to preserve FDD.
- Data producers, or an authorized data archive, assign parameters of confidentiality to the dataset, to user groups, and to selected variables.
- These parameters are then incorporated into the metadata, using the protocol of the Data Documentation Initiative (DDI).
- If the Internet is chosen as the preferred dissemination platform, a secure Web site is set up and maintained.
- A confidentiality clearance engine, or “simulator,” is incorporated into the data dissemination process. Once the user defines a subset, the simulator checks its level of safety according to the dataset parameters, and interacts with the user, who then may modify the subset until the simulator approves it.

Differentiation of data access

Although the differentiation of access modes does not directly relate to the suggested model, it may encourage data producers to adopt this model and may help leading research projects to obtain more detailed data. It is reasonable to assume that social scientists and Ph.D. students need more detailed data than undergraduate students. It is also reasonable to count on their understanding and commitment regarding protection of data confidentiality. By assigning a different access mode to different groups, data archives may acquire and preserve more detailed data.

Internet security

A well-secured Web site and a closely monitored authorization process are prerequisites for implementing the proposed model. Banks, stock exchanges, health services, schools, and government agencies, among others, use secure Web sites for handling sensitive information such as financial statements, medical records, and achievement scores. Most of these organizations not only allow their users to access information but also encourage them to perform Web-based transactions like money transfers and air travel booking. Obviously, these Web services are secured by adequate hardware and software and involve a preliminary process of authorization. A similar setup would be required for implementing the proposed model.

On-line Disclosure Control

Current procedures for protecting confidentiality treat a dataset as if each user has access to all its parts, cases, and variables. In reality, however, this need not be the model that data archives follow. The required subset of data (cases \( \times \) variables) and the details of each variable should instead be determined by the proposed research question and the method of analysis. A user who wishes to investigate inequality of incomes probably needs continuous incomes in dollars, but might abandon other variables such as detailed country of birth and MSA. On the other hand, a user studying political attitudes may be satisfied with grouped income but needs detailed schooling and occupation measures. The most typical tradeoff is between geographic identifiers and other characteristics: planning authorities typically require geographical granularity, while academic research projects tend to insist on ungrouped economic and demographic variables.

The idea is for the user to define a subset and let a confidentiality clearance engine check the defined subset against a given level of security. If a subset is cleared for a given user, it is immediately available for download or for online analysis. Otherwise, the “high-risk” variables are displayed and the user is requested either to drop them or to let the system recode them. In the process of modifying the requested subset, the user who drops key or sensitive variables may add other “neutral” variables to “reimburse” her research plan. Once the user replies, the simulator runs again and displays updated results. This simulation process may
go on for several iterations until both the user and the confidentiality clearance engine are satisfied.

Table 3 presents examples of three different subsets derived from the same dataset by three different users.

This model can easily be implemented in one of the operative data dissemination engines like Nesstar and SDA, which already allow the user to define a subset. Once the dataset confidentiality parameters are incorporated into the metadata (DDI) and a confidentiality protection algorithm is programmed in, the disclosure control simulator may be launched.

The Benefits

The inclusion of a disclosure control procedure in the process of data dissemination has several significant benefits. First, it minimizes the loss of information imposed on current users by providing them tailor-made subsets that fit their research purposes. Second, it provides the data producer and the data archive with the option of modifying parameters of statistical confidentiality over time. Under the suggested model, data producers can change levels of security or variable tagging whenever disclosure control standards or rules are changed. Third, this approach maximizes the amount of information available for future generations by allowing data archives to preserve the FDD. It also simplifies the data preservation task by reducing the number of dataset versions that have to be maintained and preserved. Last but not least, it upgrades the role of the data archive to that of a “senior partner” in the mission of encouraging and facilitating public use of data. By adopting the proposed model, data producers will both enable a more focused usage of their data and make a significant contribution to its long-term preservation.

References


Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>FULL DETAILED DATA (FDD)</th>
<th>CURRENT PUBLIC USE FILE (PUF)</th>
<th>OUTPUT VERSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USER 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4 regions</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (15 +)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10 age groups</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10 world regions</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (4 digits)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>10 1-digit classifications</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of categories of selected variables in three versions of the same dataset.
Announcements

ICPSR to Move to New Location

As announced in the Summer 2002 issue of the Bulletin, ICPSR will be moving its headquarters from the Borders Building on Maynard Street to the Perry Building, a historic structure at the edge of the University of Michigan campus. Located at the intersection of Packard Street and Madison, the Perry Building was built in 1902 to house an elementary school and in 1965 was purchased by the University of Michigan. The move to Perry will provide more square footage and growth space for ICPSR, which currently is occupying rental space in two locations.

At press time, the move had been scheduled for mid-December. Definitive dates for the move will be communicated as soon as they are available, as will new telephone and fax numbers. Only a brief interruption in data delivery is anticipated.

New Members Join ICPSR

ICPSR is pleased to announce that several new member institutions have joined the Consortium since Fall 2001. We extend a sincere welcome to the following new members:

- University of Alaska, Anchorage — Category B
- Bocconi University, Italian Federation — Category N
- Bryn Mawr College (became independent member) — Category S
- University of California at San Francisco (reinstated) — Category B
- University of Cape Town (South Africa) — Category C
- CIDE Center for Research and Teaching Economics (Mexico) — Category C
- Estado University De Campinas (Brazil) — Category C
- Fo Guang Humanity and Social Science College (Taiwan) — Category C
- Fort Valley State University (reinstated) — Category S
- Howard University (reinstated) — Category A
- Kenyon College, Associated Colleges of the Midwest Federation (reinstated) — Category S
- University of Lisbon (Portugal) — Category C
- Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research (Germany) — Category B
- Messiah College — Category B
- University of Minnesota-Duluth — Category B
- Nanyang Technological University (Singapore) — Category C
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) — Associate Membership
- National University of Singapore — Category C
- Western Washington University (reinstated) — Category B

DDI Web Site Enhancements Added

ICPSR has established an email list for individuals interested in discussing issues surrounding implementations of the Data Documentation Initiative (DDI) specification. To subscribe to the list, go to the DDI Users’ Listserv page of the DDI site at:

http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/DDI/ORG/listserv.html

In addition, the DDI site now contains a page listing tools developed specially for use with the DDI, including DDI conversion tools and DDI stylesheets. There is also a mapping on the site to go from DDI to MARC records.
ZA Spring Seminar to Be Held

The Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung in Cologne (Köln) announces its 32nd Spring Seminar, to be held March 10–28, 2003, with the focus of “Basic and Advanced Topics in Modeling.” The spring seminar is a training course for social scientists interested in advanced techniques of data analysis.

The lectures and workshops will be given (in English) by:

• Prof. Dr. Josef Brüderl, University of Mannheim, Germany, *Applied Regression Analysis Using Stata*, March 10–14, 2003
• Dr. Jeroen K. Vermunt and Dr. Andries van der Ark, Tilburg University, The Netherlands, *General Linear Models With Latent Variables*, March 17–21, 2003

Contact:
Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung Universität zu Köln, Bachemer Str. 40, 50931 Köln
Secretariat: Friederika Priemer
priemer@za.uni-koeln.de
Scientific coordinator:
Maria Rohlinger
maria.rohlinger@za.uni-koeln.de
Fax: +49-221-4769444
Web site: [www.gesis.org/ZA](http://www.gesis.org/ZA)

Additions to Holdings

**ABC News “Nightline” Catholic Church Poll, February 2002** — ABC News (ICPSR 3430)


**American Perceptions of Aging in the 21st Century [APA21], 2000** — Neal E. Cutler and Nancy A. Whitelaw (ICPSR 3326)

**CBS News Monthly Poll #1, April 2001** — CBS News (ICPSR 3342)

**CBS News Monthly Poll #1, October 2001** — CBS News (ICPSR 3376)

**CBS News Post-Debate #1 Poll, October 2000** — CBS News (ICPSR 3215)

**CBS News Pre-Debate #1 Poll, October 2000** — CBS News (ICPSR 3214)

**CBS News State of the Union Call-Back Poll, January 2000** — CBS News (ICPSR 2922)

**California Healthcare Foundation/Mercer Small Business Health Insurance Survey, 2000** — William M. Mercer, Inc. (ICPSR 3383)

**Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 2, Alabama** — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 13233)

**Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 2, Alaska** — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 13234)
Additions to Holdings (continued)


Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 2, Maryland — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 13253)


Additions to Holdings (continued)


Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) [United States]: Freshman Survey, 1976 — University of California, Los Angeles. Graduate School of Education. Higher Education Research Institute, and American Council on Education (ICPSR 2410)

Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) [United States]: Freshman Survey, 1977 — University of California, Los Angeles. Graduate School of Education. Higher Education Research Institute, and American Council on Education (ICPSR 2411)


Detroit Area Study, 1990: Collective Memories — Howard Schuman (ICPSR 2160)


Eurobarometer 55.0: European Union Enlargement, the Euro, and Dialogue on Europe, March–April 2001 — Thomas Christensen (ICPSR 3340)

Eurobarometer 55.1OVR: Young Europeans, April–May 2001 — Thomas Christensen (ICPSR 3362)


Evaluation of Law Enforcement Training for Domestic Violence Cases in a Southwestern City in Texas, 1997–1999 — Martha Smithey, Susanne E. Green, and Andrew L. Giacomazzi (ICPSR 3400)
Evaluation of No-Drop Policies for Domestic Violence Cases in San Diego, California, Omaha, Nebraska, Klamath Falls, Oregon, and Everett, Washington, 1996–2000 — Barbara E. Smith, Robert Davis, Laura B. Nickles, and Heather J. Davies (ICPSR 3319)


Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System [United States]: CJEE Extracts File, 1998 — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 3408)

Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System [United States]: CJEE Extracts File, 1999 — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 3409)

Federal Court Cases: Integrated Data Base, 2001 — Federal Judicial Center (ICPSR 3415)


Height and Weight of Students of the Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, 1878–1967 — John Komlos and Peter Coclanis (ICPSR 3391)

Height of Free African Americans in Maryland, 1800–1864 — John Komlos (ICPSR 3422)


Impact Evaluation of the Felony Domestic Violence Court in Kings County [Brooklyn], New York, 1994–2000 — Lisa Newmark, Mike Rempel, Kelly Diffily, and Kamala Mallik Kane (ICPSR 3382)


Additions to Holdings (continued)

Multiple Cause of Death, 1998
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3306)

Multiple Cause of Death, 1999
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3473)

Nativity Detail File, 1994: [United States]
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3386)

Nativity Detail File, 1995: [United States]
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3387)

Nativity Detail File, 1996: [United States]
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3388)

Nativity Detail File, 1997: [United States]
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3389)

Nativity Detail File, 1998: [United States]
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3390)

Nativity Detail File, 1999: [United States]
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3391)

National Health Interview Survey, 1999
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3397)

National Health Interview Survey, 2000
— United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3381)

National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care

National Incident-Based Reporting System, 2000

National Jail Census, 1999
— United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 3318)

— United States Office of Personnel Management (ICPSR 3419)

National Prosecutors Survey [Census], 2001
— United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 3317)

National Survey of the Japanese Elderly, 1990
— Jersey Liang and Daisaku Maeda (ICPSR 3407)

Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey, 1969: [United States]
— United States Department of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration (ICPSR 3328)

New York Times New York City Poll, August 2001
— The New York Times (ICPSR 3344)

Pennsylvania Sentencing Data, 1998
— Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing (ICPSR 3450)

— Annette Jolin, Robert Fountain, William Feyerherm, and Sharon Friedman (ICPSR 3353)

Public Libraries Data, 1987: [United States]
— United States Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics (ICPSR 2210)

Public Libraries Data, 1988: [United States]
— United States Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics (ICPSR 2211)

Public Libraries Data, 1989: [United States]
— United States Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics (ICPSR 2212)

Regional Crime Analysis Geographic Information System (RCAGIS)
— United States Department of Justice. Criminal Division Geographic Information Systems Staff, Baltimore County Police Department, and Regional Crime Analysis System Group (ICPSR 3372)

— William J. Sabol and James P. Lynch (ICPSR 3403)
Treatment Episode Data Set (TEDS), 1999 — United States Department of Health and Human Services. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Office of Applied Studies (ICPSR 3314)

Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race, 1997 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 2742)
Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race, 1998 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 2908)
Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race, 1999 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 3173)
Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race, 2000 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 3443)
Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, 2000 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 3451)
Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Hate Crime Data, 2000 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 3444)
Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Offenses Known and Clearances by Arrest, 2000 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 3447)
Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Police Employee (LEOKA) Data, 2000 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 3445)

Revisions and Updates


Revisions and Updates (continued)


Central and Eastern Euro-Barometer 4: Political and Economic Change, November 1993 — Karlheinz Reif and George Cunningham (ICPSR 6466)


Changing Patterns of Drug Abuse and Criminality Among Crack Cocaine Users in New York City, 1988–1989 — Jeffrey Fagan, Steven Belenko, and Bruce D. Johnson (ICPSR 9670)


Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) [United States]: Freshman Survey, 1974 — University of California, Los Angeles. Graduate School of Education. Higher Education Research Institute, and American Council on Education (ICPSR 2404)


Eurobarometer 44.3: Health Care Issues and Public Security, February–April 1996 — Karlheinz Reif and Eric Marlier (ICPSR 6752)

Eurobarometer 48.0: Holiday Travel, October–November 1997 — Anna Melich (ICPSR 2353)

Eurobarometer 53: Racism, Information Society, General Services, and Food Labeling, April–May 2000 — Harald Hartung (ICPSR 3064)


Federal Judicial Center Federal Court Cases: Integrated Data Base, 2001 — Federal Judicial Center (ICPSR 3415)

Fines as a Criminal Sanction: Practices and Attitudes of Trial Court Judges in the United States, 1985 — George F. Cole and Barry Mahoney (ICPSR 8945)


North Dakota Health Insurance Survey, 1998 — Alana Knudson-Buresh (ICPSR 3313)


Publication-Related Archive (PRA)

Archive of the Controversy Involving Wendy K. Tam Cho and Brian J. Gains, The American Political Science Review — Barry C. Burden, Gary King, and David C. Kimball (ICPSR 1264)


High-Tech Investment Boom and Economic Growth in the 1990s: Accounting for Quality — Michael R. Pakko (ICPSR 1263)

Making the Most of Statistical Analyses: Improving Interpretation and Presentation — Gary King, Michael Tomz, and Jason Wittenberg (ICPSR 1255)

Monetary Policy Innovation Paradox in VARs: A Discrete Explanation — Michael J. Dueker (ICPSR 1262)


CD-ROM

International Social Survey Program: Social Inequality III, 1999 — International Social Survey Program (ISSP) (ICPSR 3467)
The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), located at the Institute for Social Research in Ann Arbor, is the world’s largest repository of computer-readable social science data. For 40 years, the Consortium has served the social science community by acquiring, processing, and distributing data collections on a broad range of topics. Researchers at the Consortium’s member institutions may obtain any of these data collections at no charge; researchers at nonmember institutions may also use the data, after paying an access fee. To find out more about ICPSR’s holdings or about a specific data collection, access the ICPSR Web site at:
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