

Annual Review of Sociology

The Longitudinal Revolution: Sociological Research at the 50-Year Milestone of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics

Fabian T. Pfeffer,^{1,2} Paula Fomby,² and Noura Insolera²

¹Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104, USA;
email: fpfeffer@umich.edu

²Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104, USA

**ANNUAL
REVIEWS CONNECT**

www.annualreviews.org

- Download figures
- Navigate cited references
- Keyword search
- Explore related articles
- Share via email or social media

Annu. Rev. Sociol. 2020. 46:83–108

First published as a Review in Advance on
May 12, 2020

The *Annual Review of Sociology* is online at
soc.annualreviews.org

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054821>

Copyright © 2020 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

Keywords

surveys, longitudinal data, intergenerational, family, neighborhoods, race

Abstract

The US Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2018. Initially designed to assess the nation's progress in combatting poverty, PSID's scope broadened quickly to a variety of topics and fields of inquiry. To date, sociologists are the second-most frequent users of PSID data after economists. Here, we describe the ways in which PSID's history reflects shifts in social science scholarship and funding priorities over half a century; take stock of the most important sociological breakthroughs it facilitated, in particular those relying on the longitudinal structure of the data; and critically assess the unique advantages and limitations of PSID and surveys like it for today's sociological scholarship.

INTRODUCTION

The Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) is the world's longest-running active household panel study, launched in 1968 with a sample of 4,802 US families to study family income change. The first scientific article based on PSID public-use data was published half a century ago, in 1970. It was authored by a team of economists and focused on fluctuations in family income. In 2018 alone, contributions from sociology addressed educational inequality, multigenerational associations, parenting behavior, child health, obesity, marriage patterns, racial inequality, neighborhood segregation, career mobility, time use, and financial transfers. This review describes how and why the country's longest-running active nationally representative panel survey expanded its scope and disciplinary reach; how, in turn, it shaped sociological scholarship; some of the landmark sociological findings it enabled; and what its future may hold.

We take a data-driven approach, drawing on PSID metadata, including a complete bibliographic database, a topical classification of all variables ever publicly released, Board of Overseers membership rosters, and other sources. We begin with a brief history of PSID and some of its major changes across time, focusing on the historical, institutional, organizational, and social contexts that shaped it. We then present quantitative evidence on the representation of sociology in PSID and how sociological work has used the study. As the latter also allows us to identify the most central topical areas addressed by sociologists using PSID, we proceed to review contributions to some of those areas, namely, intergenerational processes, racial and ethnic inequality, family composition and change, and geographic contexts of opportunity. We conclude by highlighting what we consider challenges to and promises for PSID's continued relevance in supporting novel sociological insights.

This article can also be read alongside other transdisciplinary reviews, such as a recent special issue that focuses on PSID's contributions over the past half-century to selecting topical areas (Johnson et al. 2018) as well as accounts of the history and current status of PSID (Hill 1992; Brown et al. 1996; Duncan 2002; Duncan et al. 2004; McGonagle et al. 2012; McGonagle & Sastry 2015, 2016; Freedman & Cornman 2015; Sastry et al. 2018).

DESIGN OF A NATIONAL PANEL STUDY: A PRIMER

PSID was designed to interview families longitudinally to understand the degree of persistence in poverty and the factors that contributed to entry into and exit from poverty. Initially, the sample included approximately 2,000 working-age, low-income families and 3,000 families drawn from the general population. The study has a genealogical design. As children raised in PSID families reach adulthood and establish their own households, they, too, have become PSID respondents. Individuals who are related to an original PSID householder are referred to as gened sample members. This design feature allows the sample to produce, with occasional immigrant refresher samples, continuous population representation (Fitzgerald et al. 1998) and has also enabled decades of research on intergenerational transmission. Study design and content have changed over time. In 1997, in order to contain escalating study costs, roughly one-third of families were removed from the active sample using a probability subsampling strategy that ensured a higher drop rate for households from the low income oversample without young children, and the study moved from annual to biennial interviewing. To maintain population representativeness, immigrant refresher samples were added in 1997 and 2017. Questionnaire content in the main PSID interview has moved beyond a primary focus on income and employment to broaden its scope, with much of the new content emphasizing adult health and well-being. In 1988 and 2013, PSID included modules on intergenerational transfers of time and money. Since 1997, supplemental studies have captured information on child and young adult development and the well-being of older adults.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF A NATIONAL PANEL STUDY

We begin by treating PSID not as a source but as a subject of sociological inquiry. Working from a life course perspective, we situate changes in the study's design, content, and use in a variety of sociologically relevant contexts to interrogate 50 years of primary data collection as a social field. We consider the historical context that led to the inception and maintenance of PSID, the institutional context as defined by shifts in federal funding available to the social sciences, the unique organizational context of PSID's physical home, and the social context—in particular, changing gender regimes—that shaped its content.

Historical Context

The first PSID interview was completed on March 4, 1968, during a period in US history marked by rapid social change. Over the next month, student protests took root on college campuses, US ground troops killed hundreds of Vietnamese civilians in the My Lai massacre, President Lyndon Johnson announced that he would not seek re-election, and Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated. In comparison to the chaotic national mood depicted in contemporary media and in historical accounts of the period, the respondent newsletter (PSID 1968) mailed to PSID families in October described a population that was almost anachronistically staid. Nearly 4 in 10 workers had been with the same employer for a decade or longer, more than half of families had savings equal to at least two months' salary, and 2 out of 3 adults spent their leisure time driving, talking with neighbors, playing cards, or reading.

This portrait of quotidian order belies the more radical impetus to launch the world's first household panel study. PSID grew out of the War on Poverty, an expansive program of federal legislation spearheaded by President Johnson in 1964. At the time, despite an extended period of national economic growth, nearly one in five families was poor, a status that largely cleaved along racial lines. In contrast to the Depression-era New Deal program that was designed to reduce unemployment and benefit the average American household, the War on Poverty targeted those who were excluded from the country's broad economic prosperity (Bailey & Duquette 2014). The Economic Opportunity Act, passed in July 1964, provided the institutional catalyst for PSID. The act was intended to distribute resources to communities to address the root causes of poverty locally and with the participation of the intended beneficiaries. Importantly, those resources could be transferred directly to private or nonprofit agencies rather than through state or local governments. To administer and oversee the distribution of funds, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) was located independently in the executive branch. This model effectively insulated the office from federal and state legislatures and other executive departments. As a result, the office was powerful but vulnerable to political change.

In 1966 and 1967, OEO charged the US Census Bureau with administering the Survey of Economic Opportunity (SEO), a time series study to explore the causes and correlates of poverty (US Census Bur. 1970). The national sample included approximately 30,000 addresses with an oversample of addresses expected to be occupied by African American families. The same dwellings were visited in each year, regardless of whether the occupants had changed. This design was well suited to describing the share of the population experiencing poverty in each year but could not discern whether economic circumstances in a family were improving or worsening because families or individual family members who changed residence were not followed. Likely in an effort to balance the value of a more rigorous longitudinal research design against the survey's potential political sensitivity and the cost and complexity of administering it, OEO arrived at two lasting decisions (Morgan & Smith 1969a). The first was to winnow the sample down to 2,000 families with working-age household heads and family income at or below 200% of the 1966 federal poverty

line in order to focus on the population the War on Poverty programs were designed to help. The second was to outsource data collection to an external research institution.

From a pool of three applicants, the 5-year contract was awarded to the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research under the directorship of economist James N. Morgan (Morgan & Smith 1969b). Morgan, however, hesitated to take on a sample that included only low-income families because it would not identify the conditions that put families at risk of poverty. Instead, he argued successfully to pair the SEO subsample with a nationally representative sample of 3,000 families from the general population that would be drawn at SRC. Together, these families provided the foundation for PSID.¹

Institutional Context

At its inception, the purpose of PSID was “to explain the short-run changes in the economic status of individuals and families” (Morgan & Smith 1969a, p. ii). Over the ensuing half-century, the scope and research value of the study have coevolved with the funding support provided to sustain it. Compared with other long-running studies in the United States and internationally, PSID has been particularly reliant on a variety of funders who have valued the study for different purposes over time. In part, this strategy was an unintended consequence of the study's initial attachment to OEO. After the first 5-year contract ended, OEO supported one more year of data collection in 1973, with telephone interviews replacing home visits under a limited budget. Mention of future data collection in that year's user guide and respondent newsletter implied that OEO intended to continue investing in the study.

But by 1974, the Nixon administration had almost entirely shuttered OEO, and many programs and staff were relocated to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW, now the Department of Health and Human Services). Although briefly orphaned, PSID survived this move, securing an additional 5 years of funding under a series of 1-year contracts (Duncan et al. 2004). There is nothing to suggest that this continuity was assured; in fact, other research programs that moved from OEO to ASPE at the same time faced scrutiny and skepticism (Greenberg 2003). The study had the good fortune to be championed by “visionary ASPE officials” (Duncan et al. 2004, p. 159), highlighting the role of institutional actors in shaping the national data infrastructure.

During the 1970s, HEW initiated the Survey of Income and Program Participation to study family income dynamics longitudinally, a development that made PSID redundant within the agency's portfolio in terms of its original purpose. At the same time, however, the study's longevity and genealogical design were beginning to pay dividends for longitudinal research on the inter-generational transmission of income and status attainment. The National Science Foundation (NSF) had already come to see the potential for PSID to become an enduring component of the national social science data infrastructure (as emphasized in interviews with former PSID leaders) and in 1980 became the primary sponsor through its extramural grants program. Still, what eventually became a source of central support for PSID was initially built on shaky ground; in 1981, President Reagan proposed to cut social science research at NSF by 75%. NSF funding was restored by Congress, but support for PSID was substantially cut for several years, and the study's long-term prospects appeared to be freshly in jeopardy. In that period, the study's location in an academic research setting may have saved it. The director of the Institute for Social Research

¹The selection of cases for the SEO sample and their transfer to the University of Michigan were not straightforward and introduced some error. Brown (1996) describes the probability of SEO sample inclusion in PSID and evaluates its representativeness.

negotiated 3 years of supplemental support from the Ford, Sloan, and Rockefeller Foundations to sustain PSID through the mid-1980s (Duncan et al. 2004).

Also in the mid-1980s, the National Institute on Aging (NIA) first provided funding to develop a questionnaire module on family wealth that is now a standard component of the biennial main interview. Since then, NIA has become a primary sponsor to support questionnaire content on adult and late life health and a number of modules and supplements that provide opportunities to study health and well-being over the life course and across generations (Schoeni et al. 2011). In 1997, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) joined as the study's third primary sponsor to interview families with children under age 13 for the newly established Child Development Supplement and, later, to support new study content on family formation, fertility, and educational attainment.² NICHD also continues to sponsor PSID's substantial supplemental data collection on children and young adults. Sponsorship continues to be awarded through competitive extramural grant programs on a 5-year cycle, a strategy that requires PSID to serve as both a foundational component of the public social science data infrastructure and a site for research innovation in order to meet a variety of research purposes.

Organizational Context

Until 1972, SRC field interviewers visited PSID respondents in their homes and completed interviews using pencil-and-paper questionnaires. This seemingly low-tech approach to data collection was actually built upon two decades of advances in survey research and infrastructure development. Two innovations were especially relevant. First, during World War II, probability-based survey methodology gained credibility as a reliable, low-cost approach to identify federal agency spending priorities (House et al. 2004). Second, the war period created novel opportunities for collaboration between the federal government and scientists in universities and private foundations to improve public health management and increase agricultural and manufacturing productivity. In the postwar period, this collaborative effort transitioned to a model of federally funded research performed in university settings, largely through peer-reviewed extramural research programs established at NIH in 1946 and NSF in 1950. Research centers supported by external grants and contracts provided a low-risk opportunity to universities to host scientists carrying out innovative research without requiring long-term budgetary or university tenure commitments. Thus, the extramural research model provided a three-way win during a period of substantial expansion of public investment in science: The federal government could continue its support of scientific research more inexpensively than if it were to directly employ research teams and support staff; scientists could continue to develop and apply innovations in data collection to new questions, with scientific merit evaluated by peer review rather than by government priorities; and universities could capitalize on the prestige of scientific accomplishment largely supported by external funds.

PSID was launched near the end of this period of scientific expansion and benefited from SRC's established infrastructure, size, and social science culture, including access to the center's standing national sampling frame from which the general population sample was drawn. Furthermore, the availability of skilled professionals and computing resources for the enormous data processing needs of a study of this size enabled a quick and wide release of public data (beginning in 1972 and for many years within a year of the end of data collection), which was crucial in building its

²Other agencies and institutes that have supported specific questionnaire content include the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Economic Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, Lilly Family School of Philanthropy at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), the Urban Institute, and the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation of the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

user base. Another, perhaps unexpected, example arose from the study's location in the center's Economic Behavior Program, which included an interdisciplinary team of economists and psychologists. The first PSID questionnaires included measurement of social-psychological concepts such as locus of control, future orientation, risk aversion, and achievement motivation, with the expectation that these personal characteristics would explain transitions into or out of poverty. That expectation received only marginal short-run support (Smith & Morgan 1970), and most related items were eventually dropped from the questionnaire (to be reprised in later topical modules, such as the 2016 Wellbeing and Daily Life Supplement; Freedman 2017). Over time, as PSID sample management has become increasingly complex, the study has continued to benefit from and contribute to the physical concentration of infrastructural and human resources, in particular the expertise in survey methodology and survey data collection at the Institute for Social Research. In sum, the initial coalescence of funding support, organizational context, and personnel experience that enabled the eventual co-development of and integration between local infrastructure and PSID's complex requirements arose in a distinctive historical moment that likely could not be replicated today.

Social Context

The original PSID questionnaire and interview strategy were designed based on the expectations that most households³ included a primary wage earner and that in married-couple families, that person was male. As a result, men were systematically designated as the head of household where they were present, and most questionnaire content about economic activity pertained to the head's experience. Even at the time, this view of household economic organization was incomplete: More than one-third of married women were employed in 1967 (US Census Bur. 1968, table 321), and more than 40% of married working women in PSID families were working full-time in 1968 (unweighted). Furthermore, 28% percent of 1968 PSID families were female-headed (unweighted), meaning that there was no male partner or spouse in the household.

The initial choice to designate men as heads of household when present was consistent with practice at the US Census Bureau, which had used the concept of a unitary family or household head in nearly every decennial Census since 1790 (Presser 1998). Even in 1960, wives remained ineligible to be household heads on US Census forms. That this practice was a national standard and that PSID had its origins in a study administered by the Census Bureau likely contributed to adherence to this strategy. But public resistance to this practice increased during the following decade under the argument that headship implied an authority structure that families did not universally recognize (Presser 1998). In its place, the 1980 Census and other federal surveys adopted the more neutral term householder to describe the person or persons in whose name the household residence was owned or rented and allowed respondents to select which householder would be listed first if there was more than one.

In contrast, PSID retained the practices that it started with, partly because the study was not designed initially to collect parallel information on all adults in the household. Because much of the early questionnaire content pertained only to the household head, the definition of headship needed to be constant in order to allow meaningful comparison between households. In order to enable longitudinal analysis within families, only a change in family unit composition could trigger the identification of a new head. Specifically, if a male head moved out or died, his wife

³PSID uses the term family unit to describe individuals who live in a common dwelling and share living expenses. The term household refers to a physical dwelling that may be occupied by multiple family units. For ease of presentation, we use the terms family unit and household interchangeably, but they are technically distinct in PSID data and documentation.

(or, since 1983, female cohabiting partner) would become the head of the family unit. Once an unpartnered woman entered a marriage or long-term cohabiting union with a man, her spouse or partner would become the family unit head regardless of whether he was a gened PSID sample member. Thus, unlike for men, a woman's position in the family unit could (and frequently does) change over time.

To simplify data management, distribution, and use, these rules remain in place today. But over time, study leadership has taken steps to neutralize these gendered asymmetries in practice. First, the questionnaire has collected an increasing amount of information about the spouse or partner of the household head since the 1970s. Starting in 1985 with a new set of spouse/partner questions, the content collected on both partners in couple-headed households has become largely parallel and finally, based on minor additional updates in 2017, the survey instrument today yields identical information on both partners.⁴ Second, interviewers refer to family unit members by their first names, rather than by the positions they occupy in the household, and the printed materials respondents receive have generally avoided the term household head since the mid-1970s. Third, PSID study documentation replaced the phrase wife/"wife" with the term spouse/partner in 2015 and has used the term reference person in place of head since 2017. In the same year, the study began collecting parallel information on spouses or partners in same-sex unions.

PSID has slowly come to better reflect changing social and legal norms around families and marriage and has largely left behind the initial male-centric focus in its definitions of households and respondents. Over the same period, women have become a growing share of PSID interview respondents. In 1968, 9% of respondents in married-couple households were women; by 2017, this share (in married or cohabiting couples) had increased to 53%. As the sons and daughters of original PSID householders have replaced their parents as active study participants, it is increasingly the case that only one householder in any couple-headed household carries the PSID gene. That person, rather than their spouse or partner, completes the main PSID interview over 90% of the time and, in about half of cases, that person is female. Thus, in practice, PSID has shifted from interviewing a unitary (male) household head to interviewing householders who have an ancestral connection to the study, and about half of those respondents are the daughters or granddaughters of original PSID participants.

REPRESENTATION OF PEOPLE AND TOPICS

Having traced the contexts that helped shape PSID's development, we now describe PSID's changing structure and content from a quantitative perspective, focusing on its most proximate patrons, i.e., those involved in collecting the data and those using them, as well as on its content, i.e., the information collected and the information analyzed. We consider several dimensions of inputs: the characteristics of PSID leadership, the PSID Board of Overseers, and the PSID data and outputs—namely, variables and publications—to describe the representation of people and topics in PSID. Details on our data sources and data construction are detailed in **Supplemental Table 1**.

Disciplinary Representation in PSID Leadership

James Morgan, the first director of PSID, was an economist with a strong interdisciplinary orientation, a profile that has continued to be represented in the disciplinary diversity of PSID

⁴The exception is information on relationship to the family unit reference person. The questionnaire does not collect parallel information on all family unit members' relationship to the reference person's spouse or partner. However, those relationships are identified during data processing and the information is available in the stand-alone family relationship matrix (PSID 2019a).

leadership. The director team has continuously included at least one labor economist, likely both a cause and a result of the enduring content emphasis on income and employment as well as of the disciplinary composition of the majority of the public user base. This continuity has been further institutionalized by the organization of extramural funding to PSID through the Economics and cross-directorate programs at the NSF.

Over time, the study director team, Board of Overseers, and content collaborators have added disciplinary diversity to PSID's leadership. Represented fields include developmental psychology, demography, epidemiology, social psychology, sociology, and survey methodology. This multidisciplinary orientation has contributed to the inclusion of supplemental studies focused on children, young adults, and older adults; survey content on dyadic relationships between parents and adult children; and innovations in fieldwork efficiencies and respondent engagement. Contributions from sociologists have included directorship of the first two waves of the PSID Child Development Supplement under Sandra Hofferth and co-leadership in the design of the 2013 Rosters and Transfers module by Suzanne Bianchi and Judith Seltzer (see Schoeni et al. 2015).

The composition of the PSID Board of Overseers has also been marked by substantial disciplinary diversity. Averaged across the span of its existence, the Board has been composed of about a dozen members at any one time, with just less than half hailing from economics, about one-third from sociology, and the remainder from other disciplines. Remarkably, this disciplinary diversity and, in particular, the representation of sociologists among Board members is not a recent phenomenon. In fact, in each decade, there were periods when sociologists and economists were approximately equally represented on the Board (see **Supplemental Figure 1**). During the most recent years, sociologists were, in fact, in the majority. Two sociologists have also served as Board chairs: Nancy Tuma (1990–1993) and Suzanne Bianchi (2006–2008).

In contrast to the early and stable representation of sociologists on the PSID Board, the community of PSID users in sociology has grown steadily and is now represented by more than 600 PSID-based publications (a conservative estimate; see also **Supplemental Figure 2** and the description of our data collection in **Supplemental Table 1**). Among those are 64 articles published in the *American Sociological Review* or the *American Journal of Sociology* and 113 dissertations defended in sociology departments. The first dissertation in sociology that used PSID data was Erik O. Wright's 1976 doctoral thesis on "Class Structure and Income Inequality" (later published as an influential book, Wright 1979).

Topical Representation

From the first survey wave in 1968, PSID released a total 467 variables to its users. The 2017 wave, in comparison, contained 5,784 separate public-use variables. Here, we draw on a tool maintained by PSID staff, the cross-year index, that allocates each of these variables to a specific topical area. Counts of released variables are an indirect and incomplete indicator of topical representation as they are also influenced by specifics of the survey instrument (for instance, through dependent interviewing, a large number of variables may be recorded for just a small number of individuals). We account for and discuss some of these specifics below to provide a more valid analysis of topical trends (also, **Supplemental Figure 3** reports an alternative metric, namely interview minutes by topical area, for a more recent period as a validation check).⁵ **Figure 1** displays the number of

⁵In principle, we consider interview minutes the preferable indicator of where a survey puts its focus, although it has its own limitations, in particular when interview modes change over time as they have for PSID. For this and other reasons, the available minute counts for topical areas reported in **Supplemental Figure 3** only go back to 2003 and are used as a validation check for our discussion of the variable counts. Another




Figure 1

PSID variables by topical area. Lines represent the number of variables released for each PSID wave by topic. Only topical areas that represent at least 15% or more of the variables released in any wave are included (Table 1 provides a full list of topical areas). We condense age-specific childhood health variables collected since 2007 into single variables (one variable for each health condition). Abbreviation: PSID, Panel Study of Income Dynamics.

PSID variables in the four largest topical areas (each made up at least 15% of released variables in at least one wave): work (employment status, occupational information, working hours, and more), income (from labor, business, assets, transfers, and others), health (health status, health history, health insurance, and health care utilization), and consumption (housing expenditures, food expenditures, child care expenditures, and others). As Figure 1 illustrates, the number of variables in all of these four topical areas increased substantially across decades: Variables capturing work and income increased most from 1980 to the early 2000s, with a large set of variables added in the early 1990s (partly due to a switch to computer-assisted telephone interviewing that allowed for monthly reporting of work and income) and in the late 1990s (when PSID switched to biennial interviewing and, as a consequence, began collecting work and income information on the years in between survey waves). The number of variables on work declined in 2003 when the collection of employment histories was streamlined but increased again as mentions of additional jobs expanded. The number of income variables decreased in 2009 as PSID aggregated several questions about between-wave income (T-2 income). Health variables also expanded over time, first in 1999 and then again substantially in 2007, when a health history section was added. Figure 1 displays an adjusted variable count for health that deflates the large number of variables added due to age-specific reports of childhood health conditions (one variable for each age and condition) by condensing conditions into a single childhood variable. (The increase in health content is also

minor measurement limitation in our variable count estimates is a small number of duplicate variables that are released at both the individual and family levels (though we do not believe that this duplication meaningfully impacts the comparisons for the four main areas selected here) and the exclusion of some restricted-use data (such as those containing geographic identifiers).

Table 1 Panel Study of Income Dynamics–based publications by topical area

	Sociology	Nonsociology	Sociology/Nonsociology ^a
Labor market and outcomes	10.5%	13.4%	0.8
Family formation and composition	8.9%	5.3%	1.7
Racial-ethnic differences	8.3%	3.2%	2.6
Aging	6.9%	7.4%	0.9
Intergenerational influences and transfers	6.3%	3.8%	1.7
Education attainment and achievement	6.2%	4.9%	1.3
Income	5.5%	6.6%	0.8
Neighborhoods and geographic mobility	4.8%	2.8%	1.7
Poverty	4.7%	3.3%	1.4
Gender differences	4.4%	3.8%	1.2
Other topics ^b	33.4%	45.7%	0.7
Total (publications)	100.0%	100.0%	

Percentages express the share of sociological/other publications assigned to a given topical area, with each publication typically assigned to multiple areas.

^aCompares the share of publications in a given topical area between those publications designated to sociology versus those designated to a different field with a ratio above 1 indicating that sociology publications are more likely to address a given topic.

^bCategories included under other topics (in descending order of prevalence in sociology) are: wealth, children, health, child development supplement, life course, time use and home production, well-being, government transfers, housing, statistical and econometric models, international studies, expenditures, transition to adulthood supplement, food and nutrition, retirement, taxes, philanthropy, disability and use of time.

reflected in the average interview minutes spent in the health section of the survey, which increased by about 5 minutes in 2007; see **Supplemental Figure 3**.) Finally, consumption variables were significantly expanded in 1999. Overall, **Figure 1** underlines that multiple topical areas expanded over the 50 years, implying that the expansion of one area typically did not come at the expense of others.

Turning to the scientific contributions PSID has enabled, we draw on the collection of PSID-based contributions published in sociological outlets (see **Supplemental Table 1** for a detailed definition and discussion). This allows us to describe the representation of topical areas in sociological scholarship and how sociology differs from other disciplines in its use of PSID. **Table 1** lists the share of sociology and nonsociology publications that fall within each topical field and reveals the ten most commonly studied topics in the PSID-based sociological literature—labor market outcomes, family formation and composition, racial-ethnic differences, aging, intergenerational influences and transfers, educational attainment and achievement, income, neighborhoods and geographic mobility, poverty, and gender differences. To show how sociological use of PSID differs from other disciplines, we compare the share of each topical area covered in PSID-based articles in sociology journals to the share of each topical area covered in PSID-based articles in nonsociology journals, with the ratio reported in the right-most column of **Table 1**. It shows, for instance, that the attention paid to the topic of racial and ethnic differences compared with all other topics is much higher (2.6 times as high) in PSID publications in sociological outlets than in nonsociological outlets. Other topical areas that are frequently and disproportionately addressed by sociologists are intergenerational influences and transfers, family formation and composition, and neighborhoods and geographic mobility. We review these four areas in more detail below and describe the sociological insights in each area that PSID has been able to support. We note that PSID has also contributed to new sociological knowledge in many other topical areas that we lack space to explore here. Topics that are more often addressed using PSID data in sociology outlets compared with nonsociology outlets also include but are not limited to poverty, educational attainment and achievement, and gender differences.

Finally, we provide another perspective on the use of PSID in sociology and the unique contributions of PSID-based research to the sociological literature based on an analysis of the 50 most-cited publications in each of the field's two flagship journals, *American Sociological Review* and *American Journal of Sociology*, in two historical periods (1970–2007 and 2008–2018; for details, see **Supplemental Table 1**). Strikingly, the PSID-based publications that are among the top 200 of the discipline all fall into the topical area of intergenerational effects (Duncan et al. 1998, Torche 2011) and, within that, the intergenerational effects of neighborhood conditions (Brooks-Gunn et al. 1993, Sharkey 2008, Sharkey & Elwert 2011, Wodtke et al. 2011). That is, two of the topics identified as the subject of sociological inquiry more often compared with other disciplines—intergenerational influences and neighborhood effects—are also highly influential, as they are addressed in some of the most widely cited contributions in the top journals of the discipline.

SOCIOLOGICAL LANDMARK FINDINGS BASED ON PSID

Intergenerational Processes

Contributions to this area of research have estimated intergenerational correlations for a range of socioeconomic and demographic outcomes, investigated inequalities in educational opportunity, traced the transmission of socio-economic status across multiple generations, and highlighted the distinct contribution of a prospective approach to social mobility.

Intergenerational mobility. Sociologists rightfully claim a productive and long-standing line of research on intergenerational social mobility and intergenerational influences that precedes that of other fields, including economics (Torche 2015, Mazumder 2018). However, after a replication of the classical status attainment model (Blau & Duncan 1967) by Corcoran (1980), PSID-based contributions were largely absent from the burgeoning literature on social class mobility of the 1980s (Ganzeboom et al. 1991). This may be partly due to the initially limited detail of the released occupational information as costs associated with occupational coding and data (tape) storage led to the use of one-digit occupational codes for the first survey waves. Along with a later switch to two- and three-digit occupation coding, a suggestion by a sociologist to add survey items on occupational characteristics helped open the possibility of a sociological class analysis based on PSID (Wright 1979, p. 238) and supported later, long-term assessments of occupation-based class mobility (e.g., Hertel & Pfeffer 2020).

Following seminal contributions in economics (e.g., Solon 1992), sociologists have also focused on intergenerational correlations in earnings and income and documented their heterogeneity across population groups. For instance, Torche (2011) found that intergenerational income and earnings correlations differ by offspring's educational attainment, with those attaining a college degree being most mobile. Bloome (2014) documented stark racial differences in income mobility, with particularly high levels of downward mobility among African American compared with white sample members (see also Wilson 2009). Bloome (2015) also revealed large differences in the levels of and trends in income mobility across US states and used this variation to demonstrate that social mobility and social inequality are largely independent from each other, a finding that contrasts with international comparisons of the relationship between income inequality and mobility, also partly based on PSID (Corak 2013).

Intergenerational associations and education. Sizeable intergenerational correlations have also been found for other dimensions of socioeconomic well-being, such as poverty status and welfare receipt (Corcoran 1995, Martin 2003), neighborhood poverty (Sharkey 2008), and family wealth

(Pfeffer & Killewald 2018). Beyond estimating intergenerational correlations, sociologists have also investigated associations between different characteristics of origin families, such as family structure (Lopoo & DeLeire 2014) or family instability (McLanahan & Bumpass 1988) and different outcomes of the next generation. By far the most heavily studied outcome of the next generation is educational attainment. Here, PSID has supported a more encompassing view of parental resources: Researchers have gone beyond measures of parental degree completion to consider parents' college attendance without a degree (Fomby & Cross 2018) or the prestige of parents' postsecondary institution (Ford & Thompson 2016), in both cases finding a weak relationship with their offspring's probability of obtaining a college degree. Going beyond the role of parental education and family income in predicting educational success, researchers have documented the independent role of parental wealth (Conley 2001b, Williams Shanks 2007, Pfeffer 2018), parental homeownership (Conley 2001a, Mohanty & Raut 2009), the quality of parental employment conditions (Yetis-Bayraktar et al. 2013), and neighborhood conditions (Harding 2003; Wodtke et al. 2011, 2016). Multiple studies have shown that various parental investments facilitate offspring's educational success, including investments of money (Hill & Duncan 1987, DeLeire & Kalil 2005, Benton & Keister 2017), time (Hsin 2009, Milkie et al. 2015, Fomby & Musick 2018), and the use of particular parenting practices geared at imparting social capital (Hofferth et al. 1998, 1999) or cultural capital (Lareau & Weininger 2008, Carolan & Wasserman 2015, Weininger et al. 2015).

Multigenerational mobility. As the PSID sample has grown beyond two generations of family members, it increasingly supports investigations of multigenerational mobility and associations (Mare 2011, Pfeffer 2014). Recent contributions have documented three-generational associations along a variety of dimensions, including social class (Hertel & Groh-Samberg 2014), income (Wightman & Danziger 2014), education (Pfeffer 2014, Song & Mare 2017), wealth (Pfeffer & Killewald 2018), neighborhood characteristics (Sharkey & Elwert 2011), fertility (Fomby et al. 2014), and parenting behaviors (Roksa & Patter 2011). Other research has expanded measures of family background by considering extended family networks, including aunts and uncles (Prix & Pfeffer 2017, Erola et al. 2018) and stepparents (Seltzer 2019, Wiemers et al. 2019).

Prospective approaches. PSID's prospective panel design also uniquely supports prospective analyses of the maintenance of inequality across generations. Rather than beginning with an analytic sample of offspring and tracing their socioeconomic roots back to prior generations, the prospective approach begins with a baseline population and ascertains the channels through which it maintains socioeconomic (dis)advantage across following generations (Mare 2011, Maralani 2013, Song & Mare 2015). This approach differs from the classical retrospective perspective as it necessarily takes into account demographic processes involved in intergenerational reproduction processes (Duncan 1966), such as fertility or family formation processes, which we discuss below. The prospective approach is also particularly well-suited to assess the population-level effects of social policies (Hofferth et al. 2002, Hofferth & Stanhope 2005).

Racial and Ethnic Inequality

In this area of research, many contributions have focused on describing and explaining Black-white gaps in wages and job mobility, how neighborhoods segregate along racial and ethnic lines, and the large racial gaps in housing and wealth.

Labor market outcomes and careers. A large PSID-based literature has focused on racial inequality, most often Black-white gaps, in labor market outcomes and careers. Many contributions

documented and sought explanations for the racial wage gap: Contrary to Wilson's (1978) thesis of the declining significance of race, authors documented that the Black-white wage gap continued to increase during the 1970s and 1980s as well as across individuals' life courses (Cancio et al. 1996, Wilson & Sakura-Lemessy 2000, Maume 2004a) and, in the absence of observable explanatory factors, likely increased due to discrimination (Maume 2004a). Underlying these wage gaps are racial differences in occupational positions: Wright (1978) showed that the lower income returns to education for Black men compared with white men are largely explained by differences in social class attainment. Others documented Black-white differences in access to and in the wage return to job authority (Mueller 1989, Wilson 1997).

Another set of contributions underlined the importance of economic contexts for racial inequality, tracing the influence of labor market conditions on race differences in wages (Parcel 1979) and female labor-force participation (Browne 2000). Progress toward racial labor market equality has been shown to be either limited or fleeting: Ren (2019) showed that Black-white earnings gaps have declined only among the college-educated and during economic upswings. Maume (1985) documented that the earnings of Black men and women were higher in areas with a strong public sector, yet more recent shifts toward privatizing public sector institutions eroded the progress toward racial wage parity made within the public sector (Wilson et al. 2015).

Finally, taking full advantage of the longitudinal feature of PSID, many contributions investigated racial differences in job mobility. Early on, Black workers were shown to be less able to make voluntary moves to improve their careers as well as to avoid involuntary changes, such as layoffs (Sorensen & Fuerst 1978, DiPrete 1981). Whether the obstacles to upward mobility faced by racial minorities constitute a glass ceiling was debated after an influential article by Cotter et al. (2001) reported that Black men face a consistent race penalty at all points in their careers and at all income levels (rather than greater disadvantage at later career stages and higher incomes), a pattern inconsistent with a glass ceiling as defined by these authors. Subsequent work, however, found patterns consistent with a racial glass ceiling, in particular in terms of Black employees' access to managerial and other privileged occupational positions (Maume 2004b, Wilson et al. 2019). More broadly, researchers found slower promotion rates to managerial positions among Black and Latino workers compared with white workers, and those promotions are more likely to be based on formal qualifications and experience than for whites (Maume 1999, Wilson & Maume 2014); the reverse pattern holds for downward mobility (McBrier & Wilson 2004, Wilson & McBrier 2005). Again, these racial differences in the patterns of job mobility are less marked in the public sector compared with the private sector (Wilson et al. 1999, 2013; Wilson & Roscigno 2010).

Neighborhood sorting. Another substantial strand of research on racial inequality supported by PSID consists of studies of neighborhood sorting. Largely motivated by *The Truly Disadvantaged*, another seminal work by Wilson (1987), many contributions have compared residential mobility patterns of whites and nonwhites to understand high levels of racial and ethnic segregation and inequality in exposure to neighborhood disadvantage. Massey et al. (1994) found that the geographic concentration of poor Blacks, contrary to Wilson's thesis, is not caused by nonpoor Blacks leaving urban neighborhoods. Subsequent research also showed that Blacks were much less likely than whites to escape poor neighborhoods and more likely to move into them, even when they hold similar socioeconomic characteristics and despite similar preferences for mobility (South & Crowder 1997, 1998; Crowder 2001). While non-Hispanic Blacks face the highest risk of moving into a high-poverty neighborhood, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans show the highest rates of persisting in high-poverty neighborhoods (South & Crowder 2005). Furthermore, Blacks and Latinos are more likely to live in and move into neighborhoods with higher pollution hazards (Crowder & Downey 2010, Kravitz-Wirtz et al. 2016).

More recent contributions to this literature have focused on the residential choices of whites as this group is increasingly exposed to racial diversity, albeit in very segmented ways (Lichter et al. 2017). Quillian (2002) showed that explanations of continued segregation must take into account whites' avoidance of predominantly Black or multiracial neighborhoods. That avoidance is especially strong among white households with children (Goyette et al. 2014) and also extends to the avoidance of multiethnic neighborhoods and flight from neighborhoods with a large and growing immigrant population (Crowder et al. 2011, 2012). Yet, the avoidance of other-race or mixed neighborhoods is not exclusive to whites. For instance, Latinos display a level of avoidance of Black neighborhoods similar to that of whites, and Blacks display the same avoidance of Latino neighborhoods as whites (South et al. 2008). Departing from the more conventional approach of using aggregate geographic data on census tracts and blocks matched to the geocoded PSID data to trace the distribution and movement of different racial and ethnic groups, Bruch (2014) drew on PSID estimates of residential mobility for empirically grounded agent-based models of neighborhood sorting.

Housing and wealth. Racial differences in neighborhood attainment also contribute to racial inequality in wealth (Thomas et al. 2018) (although the reverse is not the case, i.e., racial gaps in wealth do not appear to explain minorities' limited access to advantaged neighborhoods; Crowder et al. 2006). In particular, the lower housing prices in neighborhoods with high minority concentration (Harris 1999) may explain why minority households accumulate less home equity and derive less equity return from their earnings and marital status (Parcel 1982). Furthermore, in a more hidden way, unequal tax benefits disadvantage minority households as white homeowners disproportionately benefit from property tax limitations (Martin & Beck 2015). Besides racial differences in returns to homeownership, homeownership itself is, of course, also marked by continued and stark racial inequality (Rank 2009, Hirschl & Rank 2010). The Great Recession further increased racial gaps in homeownership as Blacks faced a dramatically higher risk of losing their home during the foreclosure crisis (Sharp & Hall 2014).

With homeownership as the key vehicle of wealth accumulation, these inequalities also translate into large racial gaps in net worth. Racial wealth gaps have grown over time and across the life course and can be found even among otherwise more privileged segments of the population, such as the college educated (Pfeffer et al. 2013, Meschede et al. 2016, Taylor & Meschede 2018). The racial wealth gap is of intergenerational significance, e.g., as family wealth promotes the educational success of Black offspring (Williams Shanks & Destin 2009). Large Black-white gaps in extended family wealth, e.g., grandparental wealth (Chiteji 2010), also exert intergenerational influence, e.g., hindering Blacks' access to homeownership. However, Blacks are also disadvantaged in their ability to translate extended family wealth into homeownership (Hall & Crowder 2011, Pfeffer & Killewald 2018). More broadly, Black-white differences in wealth attainment are partly—but far from fully—explained by differences in parent wealth (Conley 2001c, 2006; Killewald 2013), and ongoing processes of institutional discrimination that impact the current generation of nonwhites may account for the higher levels of intergenerational downward mobility in the wealth position of Blacks (Pfeffer & Killewald 2019).

Family Composition and Change

Several contributions have furthered the understanding of family demography, focusing on the relationship between family structure and poverty, the gendered role of marriage and divorce for economic well-being, and the complexity of family and kin networks.

Family structure and poverty. Sociological scholarship using PSID has documented how families experience and negotiate poverty (Harris 1993, Massey & Shibuya 1995, Rank & Hirschl 1999, Timberlake 2007) and measured the impact of childhood poverty on achievement and status attainment across the life course (Duncan & Rodgers 1988, Wagmiller et al. 2006). In a series of influential articles, McLanahan (1983, 1985, 1988) leveraged PSID's longitudinal, intergenerational design and its inclusion of a relatively large number of families headed by unmarried women to illustrate that economic strain and family stress, more so than father absence, explained the observed association between growing up with a single parent and an elevated risk of poverty in early adulthood. This work contributed to reorienting research and public discourse about the relationship between family structure and poverty away from a pathologized view of broken families to one that emphasized the capacity for public policy to bolster children's and parents' well-being across family structures.

Gender dynamics in marriage and divorce. Rich longitudinal information on men's and women's time use and earnings paired with PSID's genealogical design have enabled a large literature on couple-level unpaid labor (Rexroat & Shehan 1987, Brines 1994, Lareau & Weininger 2008, Sandberg & Hofferth 2001) and earned income dynamics (Farkas 1976, Heckert et al. 1998, South 2001, Evertsson & Neramo 2004) and on gender differences in economic well-being after divorce (Espenshade 1979, Weiss 1984, Zick & Smith 1991). This work has documented that over historical time, women's higher earned income relative to husbands' has become a less salient predictor of divorce (Ono 1998, Heckert et al. 1998, Schwartz & Gonalons-Pons 2016), but men's declining employment prospects have contributed to a decline in marriage rates (Schneider et al. 2018) and marriages in which men are unemployed remain at elevated risk of divorce (Killewald 2016). Other work has demonstrated that although men's household income recovers following divorce more quickly than women's (Duncan & Hoffman 1985b) and men are less dependent on remarriage to regain economic stability (Duncan & Hoffman 1985a), divorce also carries significant financial consequences for them (McManus & DiPrete 2001).

Kin networks and family complexity. The PSID household rosters, marriage and birth histories, time use supplements, and periodic extrahousehold family rosters have permitted careful analysis of kin networks and dynamic family relationships within and across households (Hofferth 1984, Hofferth & Anderson 2003, Seltzer et al. 2005, Carr et al. 2019, Seltzer 2019). Key to this research is the precise work performed by PSID interviewers and data processing staff to update and review field notes that describe family relationships. A significant set of recent innovations described time and money exchanges between older adults and their children and stepchildren (Friedman et al. 2015, Wiemers et al. 2019). Other recent work has characterized the full scope of change in household composition to yield new insights about the prevalence of extended kin coresidence among children in African American and Latinx families (Cross 2018) and the frequency of their experience of household instability beyond parents' union status changes (Perkins 2019).

Geographic Contexts of Opportunity

Drawing on geographic identifiers of PSID households, such as census tracts or blocks, researchers have traced the impact of neighborhood characteristics, including racial segregation, on later-life outcomes and the next generation. With advances in spatial analysis and open access to linkable contextual data, the opportunities for research on the effects of neighborhoods also continue to grow.

Neighborhoods and the life course. Since the first wave of PSID, families have answered questions about their homes and neighborhoods, indicated whether they moved since their last interview, and reported their addresses. Parcel (1979) was one of the first to link geographic identifiers from PSID to aggregated census data to find that residential segregation and racial competition dampened earnings levels for Black individuals. South & Crowder (2010) used information about the neighborhoods in which PSID families reside as well as the surrounding neighborhoods to show that contexts with high poverty increase women's risk of becoming an unmarried parent. Other research also considered the effects of changes in neighborhood contexts on the socioeconomic well-being of residents. For instance, growth in attractive rural areas has been shown to bring some socioeconomic gains to long-term residents, though mostly to those in low-status occupations (Saint Onge et al. 2007), and those gains are largely counterbalanced by rising costs of living in these areas (Hunter et al. 2005).

Intergenerational neighborhood effects. Crowder & South (2003) documented that increases in the concentration of urban poverty have reinforced the link between socioeconomic distress and school dropout rates, and Harding (2003) confirmed a causal effect of childhood neighborhood characteristics on high school dropout and teenage pregnancy. Wodtke and colleagues (2011) built on this research to establish the particularly large effect of sustained exposure to disadvantaged neighborhoods on high school graduation rates. Similar research has used PSID to follow children through adolescence and adulthood to study long-term poverty exposure and its negative association with cognitive skills (Brooks-Gunn et al. 1993, Jackson & Mare 2007, Timberlake 2007). Wodtke & Parbst (2017) showed that neighborhood effects on academic achievement are not mediated by the composition of local schools. Corcoran & Adams (1995) found that men's labor supply is related to the working hours observed in their childhood neighborhood context.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

We end this review with a discussion of some of the characteristics of PSID and similar studies that create challenges and opportunities for their future position in the social science data universe.

The Single Respondent

Unlike other household panel studies, the main PSID interview is conducted with one respondent per family unit (with only two exceptions, in 1976 and 1985). In many ways, this is an obvious and economical way to manage a (primarily) telephone interview. Depending on interview content, the time, effort, and expense required to speak directly with multiple family members by telephone may not yield much additional information beyond what a knowledgeable respondent could report on their behalf. The practice of interviewing a single respondent is, however, a convention that remains from the study's first wave of in-person data collection, when household heads were reporting mostly about their own activity.

As questionnaire content has changed, this approach has imposed some constraints on the individuals about whom such content can be collected reliably. Today, a large share of the core survey content is collected only about reference persons (formerly household heads) and spouses or partners; very little information is collected about other household members, including minors. (Respondents report on the current employment status and earnings and education, marriage, and birth histories of all adult household members, but with more item nonresponse.) For a limited number of items, such as questions about mental health, respondents answer only for themselves and attitudinal measures are avoided (see also Alwin 2007, p. 152). In order to collect more

detailed information about other family unit members, PSID has regularly conducted supplemental studies of sample children and young adults (many of whom remain in their parents' households) since 1997. The content, design, and analytic utility of those supplements is beyond the scope of this article, but they have made a significant contribution to life course scholarship by providing much richer information about early life experience than other panel studies have been able to collect (McGonagle & Sastry 2015). PSID has also periodically collected supplements directly from both the reference person and spouse/partner in a couple, on topics such as well-being, cognitive skills, time use, and childhood circumstances. In addition, data files are available to identify the relationships between all individuals within and between family units over time regardless of whether they have been interviewed directly. These include birth and marriage histories for all adults observed since 1985, the Family Identification Mapping System to identify an individual's vertical (e.g., parent, grandparent, child, and grandchild) and sibling relations, and the family relationship matrix, which describes how all coresident family unit members are related in each wave. Together, supplements and relationship data files leverage the content collected during the biennial core interview to study intergenerational relationships over the life course and historical time.

The Age of Big Data

By some measures, PSID is big data: Through its 2017 survey wave, it contains information on more than 80,000 individuals and has collected nearly as many variables. But, of course, the excitement and, at times, lofty expectations of the big data revolution in sociology are based on other types of big data, often full-population administrative records (e.g., a census) or organic data continuously flowing from electronic or online systems (e.g., Twitter streams or phone location tracking data). The competitive challenge these data pose to comparatively small social scientific survey data may seem nowhere more obvious than for one of the core areas of PSID, the study of intergenerational mobility (Grusky et al. 2015). Do we need PSID for the study of income mobility if we can link high-quality income tax records across generations for the entire United States (Chetty et al. 2014b)? Full-population records are much better suited for the estimation of an intergenerational income correlation for different areas of the country (Chetty et al. 2014a) or different parts of the income distribution (Mitnik et al. 2015). However, these data have their own bias-inducing limitations (see Mitnik et al. 2019). In fact, PSID has been used to demonstrate and correct for those biases (Mazumder 2016). The clear comparative disadvantages of many of these data sources, however, are the restriction to a much smaller set of measures of socioeconomic well-being as well as the considerably more restrictive access to individual-level records, in the case of Internal Revenue Service tax data, reserved to just a handful of scientists.

The real promise for new insights and innovative sociological research will likely come from combining the comparative advantages of these different types of data through data linkage (Groves 2011, p. 869). For instance, ongoing efforts to link PSID to the 1940 Census as well as real estate housing data will further expand opportunities for multigenerational and multidimensional assessments of social mobility.

Prospective Studies and Population Change

One of PSID's most enduring innovations was the choice to follow split-off adult children in PSID families who established their own households, which is the design element that has enabled intergenerational and multigenerational analysis. In a population with no immigration, this approach would have been ideal as a strategy to maintain population representativeness without sample refreshment. And in the late 1960s, the impact of immigration on population composition

might have felt relatively trivial compared with the impact during most other historical periods: Only about 5% of the US population was foreign-born in 1960 (US Census Bur. 1999), compared with 13.7% in 2017 (US Census Bur. 2017). To account for population change, PSID added new families through immigrant refresher samples in 1997 and 2017.⁶ These families included a householder who was foreign-born and entered the United States after 1968 (or 1997 for the more recent refresher) or who was born after 1968 (1997) to a parent who entered the United States after that year (PSID 2019b). Samples are proportional in size to their representation in the US population. The PSID refreshers are relatively infrequent compared with international panel studies, which occur in geographically more concentrated populations and also may be able to sample from registry data rather than from door-to-door screeners. In the US context, refreshers on special, hard-to-reach populations are expensive to implement, and the obtained samples are challenging to retain. And while immigrant refreshers offer immediate benefit by providing improved cross-sectional estimates, their payoff to longitudinal and intergenerational analysis takes much longer to accrue.

The Life Course of the Longitudinal Revolution

Like others in their early fifties, PSID today is not what it set out to become. At its core are approximately 2,000 families who were poor or low-income in a time of plenty and a federal government agency that asked how to improve their life chances. Two early innovations—the addition of a population-representative sample and a design that allowed the sample to replenish itself over time—gave the study the momentum to continue beyond its first 5 years. Built on this foundation, PSID has ridden out historical, institutional, technological, and social changes that have contoured sample composition, questionnaire content, and the study’s position in the national data infrastructure. We argue that it has survived because it has proven flexible to scholarly, policy, and funding priorities across a variety of social science research regimes. It continues to do so, for instance, through web-based survey data collection (Couper & McGonagle 2019) and biomarker measurement (Sastry et al. 2009). Certainly, the study that PSID has become is likely not the study it would be if it were to begin today (see also Moffitt et al. 2015). A new study might begin with a larger sample and perform more frequent population refreshers, both to capture new populations and as a buffer against attrition. It might pair survey interviews with linkages to administrative data in order to harness the synergies between these modes of data collection. And like most other current national longitudinal studies, it might obtain the majority of its support from a steady single sponsor, a path that carries its own risks for continued relevance. But of course, were it left to the present day, the study might never have begun at all.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors hold affiliations with the Panel Study of Income Dynamics: Pfeffer and Fomby as Co-Investigators and Insolera as Team Leader of the PSID Education and Outreach group.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Wendy Dong for excellent research assistance and Samuel Hansen for generous support in matching to the Web of Science database. We also thank Charles Brown, Greg

⁶An additional 2,000 Latinx households were included in 1990–1995, but this sample was eventually dropped in favor of an immigrant refresher representative of all places of origin.

J. Duncan, Sandra Hofferth, Robert F. Schoeni, and Frank P. Stafford for providing valuable historical information in personal interviews and feedback on this manuscript, as well as Vicki Freedman, Katherine McGonagle, David Johnson, Narayan Sastry, and an anonymous reviewer for constructive feedback on an earlier version of this manuscript. Errors and omissions are our own. The collection of data used in this study was partly supported by the National Institutes of Health under grant numbers R01 HD069609 and R01 AG040213 and the National Science Foundation under award numbers SES 1157698 and 1623684.

LITERATURE CITED

- Alwin DF. 2007. *Margins of Error: A Study of Reliability in Survey Measurement*. New York: Wiley
- Bailey MJ, Duquette NJ. 2014. How Johnson fought the War on Poverty: the economics and politics of funding at the Office of Economic Opportunity. *J. Econ. Hist.* 74(2):351–88
- Benton RA, Keister LA. 2017. The lasting effect of intergenerational wealth transfers: human capital, family formation, and wealth. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 68:1–14
- Blau PM, Duncan OD. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Free
- Bloome D. 2014. Racial inequality trends and the intergenerational persistence of income and family structure. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 79(6):1196–225
- Bloome D. 2015. Income inequality and intergenerational income mobility in the United States. *Soc. Forces* 93(3):1047–80
- Brines J. 1994. Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *Am. J. Sociol.* 100(3):652–88
- Brooks-Gunn J, Duncan GJ, Klebanov PK, Sealander N. 1993. Do neighborhoods influence child and adolescent development? *Am. J. Sociol.* 99(2):353–95
- Brown C. 1996. *Notes on the “SEO” or “census” component of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics*. Tech. Ser. Pap. 96–03, Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich., Ann Arbor
- Brown C, Duncan GJ, Stafford FP. 1996. Data watch: the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. *J. Econ. Perspect.* 10(2):155–68
- Browne I. 2000. Opportunities lost? Race, industrial restructuring, and employment among young women heading households. *Soc. Forces* 78(3):907–29
- Bruch EE. 2014. How population structure shapes neighborhood segregation. *Am. J. Sociol.* 119(5):1221–78
- Cancio AS, Evans TD, Maume DJ Jr. 1996. Reconsidering the declining significance of race: racial differences in early career wages. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 61(August):541–56
- Carolan BV, Wasserman SJ. 2015. Does parenting style matter? Concerted cultivation, educational expectations, and the transmission of educational advantage. *Sociol. Perspect.* 58(2):168–86
- Carr D, Cornman JC, Freedman VA. 2019. Do family relationships buffer the impact of disability on older adults’ daily mood? An exploration of gender and marital status differences. *J. Marriage Fam.* 81:729–46
- Chetty R, Hendren N, Kline P, Saez E. 2014a. Where is the land of opportunity? The geography of intergenerational mobility in the United States. *Q. J. Econ.* 129(4):1553–623
- Chetty R, Hendren N, Kline P, Saez E, Turner N. 2014b. Is the United States still a land of opportunity? Recent trends in intergenerational mobility. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 104(5):141–47
- Chiteji NS. 2010. Wealth in the extended family: an American dilemma. *Du Bois Rev.* 7(2):357–79
- Conley D. 2001a. A room of one’s own or a room with a view? Housing and educational stratification. *Sociol. Forum.* 16(2):263–80
- Conley D. 2001b. Capital for college: parental assets and postsecondary schooling. *Sociol. Educ.* 74(1):59–72
- Conley D. 2001c. Decomposing the black-white wealth gap: the role of parental resources, inheritance, and investment dynamics. *Sociol. Inq.* 71(1):39–66
- Conley D. 2006. Being black, living in the red: wealth matters. In *The Race, Class, and Gender in the United States*, ed. PS Rothenberg, pp. 350–57. New York: Macmillan
- Corak M. 2013. Income inequality, equality of opportunity, and intergenerational mobility. *J. Econ. Perspect.* 27(3):79–102

- Corcoran M. 1980. Sex differences in measurement error in status attainment. In *Five Thousand American Families: Patterns of Economic Progress*, Vol. 8, ed. GJ Duncan, JN Morgan, pp. 241–76. Ann Arbor, MI: Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich.
- Corcoran M. 1995. Rags to rags: poverty and mobility in the United States. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 21:237–67
- Corcoran M, Adams T. 1995. Family and neighborhood welfare dependency and son's labor supply. *J. Fam. Econ. Issues.* 16:239–64
- Cotter DA, Hermesen JM, Ovadia S, Vanneman R. 2001. The glass ceiling effect. *Soc. Forces* 80(2):655–81
- Couper MP, McGonagle K. 2019. *Recent developments in web-based data collection for longitudinal studies*. PSID Tech. Ser. Pap. 19–03, Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich., Ann Arbor
- Cross CJ. 2018. Extended family households among children in the United States: differences by race/ethnicity and socio-economic status. *Popul. Stud.* 72(2):235–51
- Crowder K, Hall M, Tolnay SE. 2011. Neighborhood immigration and native out-migration. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 76(1):25–47
- Crowder K, Pais J, South SJ. 2012. Neighborhood diversity, metropolitan constraints, and household migration. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 77(3):325–44
- Crowder KD. 2001. Racial stratification in the actuation of mobility expectations: microlevel impacts of racially restrictive housing markets. *Soc. Forces* 79(4):1377–96
- Crowder KD, Downey L. 2010. Inter-neighborhood migration, race, and environmental hazards: modeling micro-level processes of environmental inequality. *Am. J. Sociol.* 115(4):1110–49
- Crowder KD, South SJ. 2003. Neighborhood distress and school dropout: the variable significance of community context. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 32(4):659–98
- Crowder KD, South SJ, Chavez E. 2006. Wealth, race, and inter-neighborhood migration. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 71(1):72–94
- DeLeire T, Kalil A. 2005. How do cohabiting couples with children spend their money? *J. Marriage Fam.* 67(2):286–95
- DiPrete T. 1981. Unemployment over the life cycle: racial differences and the effect of changing economic conditions. *Am. J. Sociol.* 87(2):286–307
- Duncan GJ. 2002. The PSID and me. In *Landmark Studies of the 20th Century in the US*, ed. E Phelps, FF Furstenberg Jr, A Colby, pp. 133–66. New York: Russell Sage
- Duncan GJ, Hofferth SL, Stafford FP. 2004. Evolution and change in family income, wealth and health: the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, 1968–2000 and beyond. In *A Telescope on Society: Survey Research and Social Science at the University of Michigan and Beyond*, ed. JS House, FT Juster, RL Kahn, H Schuman, E Singer, pp. 156–94. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
- Duncan GJ, Hoffman S. 1985a. A reconsideration of the economic consequences of marital dissolution. *Demography* 22(4):485–97
- Duncan GJ, Hoffman S. 1985b. Economic consequences of marital instability. In *Horizontal Equity, Uncertainty, and Economic Well-Being*, ed. M David, T Smeeding, pp. 427–70. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Duncan GJ, Rodgers W. 1988. Longitudinal aspects of childhood poverty. *J. Marriage Fam.* 50(4):1007–21
- Duncan GJ, Yeung W-JJ, Brooks-Gunn J, Smith J. 1998. How much does childhood poverty affect the life chances of children? *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 63(3):406–23
- Duncan OD. 1966. Methodological issues in the analysis of social mobility. In *Social Structure and Mobility and Economic Development*, ed. NJ Smelser, SM Lipset, pp. 52–97. Chicago: Aldine
- Erola J, Kilpi-Jakonen E, Pii I, Lehti H. 2018. Resource compensation from the extended family: grandparents, aunts, and uncles in Finland and the United States. *Eur. Sociol. Rev.* 34(4):348–64
- Espenshade TJ. 1979. The economic consequences of divorce. *J. Marriage Fam.* 41(3):615–25
- Evertsson M, Neramo M. 2004. Dependence within families and the division of labor: comparing Sweden and the United States. *J. Marriage Fam.* 66(5):1272–86
- Farkas G. 1976. Education, wage rates, and the division of labor between husband and wife. *J. Marriage Fam.* 38(3):473–84
- Fitzgerald J, Gottschalk P, Moffitt R. 1998. An analysis of the impact of sample attrition on the second generation of respondents in the Michigan Panel Study of Income Dynamics. *J. Hum. Resour.* 33(2):300–344

- Fomby P, Cross CJ. 2018. Parents who left college and children's postsecondary educational attainment. *Sociol. Forum.* 33(4):923–49
- Fomby P, Krueger PM, Wagner NM. 2014. Age at childbearing over two generations and grandchildren's cognitive achievement. *Res. Soc. Stratif. Mobil.* 35:71–88
- Fomby P, Musick K. 2018. Mothers' time, the parenting package, and links to healthy child development. *J. Marriage Fam.* 80(1):166–81
- Ford KS, Thompson J. 2016. Inherited prestige: intergenerational access to selective universities in the United States. *Res. Soc. Stratif. Mobil.* 46:86–98
- Freedman VA. 2017. *The Panel Study of Income Dynamics' Well Being and Daily Life Supplement (PSID-WB) User Guide: Final Release 1*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich.
- Freedman VA, Cornman JC. 2015. *The Panel Study of Income Dynamics: Second Supplement on Disability and Use of Time (DUST 2013). User Guide: Release 2015.3*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich.
- Friedman EM, Park SS, Wiemers EE. 2015. New estimates of the sandwich generation in the 2013 Panel Study of Income Dynamics. *Gerontologist* 57(2):191–96
- Ganzeboom HBG, Treiman DJ, Ultee WC. 1991. Comparative intergenerational stratification research: three generations and beyond. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 17:277–302
- Goyette K, Iceland J, Weininger E. 2014. Moving for the kids: examining the influence of children on white residential segregation. *City Community* 13(2):158–78
- Greenberg DH. 2003. *Social Experimentation and Public Policymaking*. Washington, DC: Urban Inst.
- Groves RM. 2011. Three eras of survey research. *Public Opin. Q.* 75(5):861–71
- Grusky DB, Smeeding TM, Snipp CM. 2015. A new infrastructure for monitoring social mobility in the United States. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci.* 657(1):63–82
- Hall M, Crowder K. 2011. Extended-family resources and racial inequality in the transition to homeownership. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 40(6):1534–46
- Harding D. 2003. Counterfactual models of neighborhood effects: the effect of neighborhood poverty on high school dropout and teenage pregnancy. *Am. J. Sociol.* 109(3):676–719
- Harris DR. 1999. "Property values drop when blacks move in, because...": racial and socioeconomic determinants of neighborhood desirability. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 64(3):461–79
- Harris KM. 1993. Work and welfare among single mothers in poverty. *Am. J. Sociol.* 99(2):317–52
- Heckert DA, Nowak TC, Snyder KA. 1998. The impact of husbands' and wives' relative earnings on marital disruption. *J. Marriage Fam.* 60(3):690–703
- Hertel FR, Groh-Samberg O. 2014. Class mobility across three generations in the U.S. and Germany. *Res. Soc. Stratif. Mobil.* 35:35–52
- Hertel FR, Pfeffer FT. 2020. The land of opportunity? Trends in social mobility and education in the United States. In *Education and Intergenerational Social Mobility in Europe and the United States*, ed. R Breen, W Müller, pp. 29–68. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Hill MS, ed. 1992. *The Panel Study of Income Dynamics: A User's Guide to Major Social Science Data Bases*, Vol. 2. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Hill MS, Duncan GJ. 1987. Parental family income and the socioeconomic attainment of children. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 16(1):39–73
- Hirschl TA, Rank MR. 2010. Homeownership across the American life course: estimating the racial divide. *Race Soc. Probl.* 2(3–4):125–36
- Hofferth SL. 1984. Kin networks, race and family structure. *J. Marriage Fam.* 46(4):791–806
- Hofferth SL, Anderson KG. 2003. Are all dads equal? Biology versus marriage as a basis for paternal investment. *J. Marriage Fam.* 65(1):213–32
- Hofferth SL, Boisjoly J, Duncan GJ. 1998. Parents' extrafamilial resources and children's school attainment. *Sociol. Educ.* 71(3):246–68
- Hofferth SL, Boisjoly J, Duncan GJ. 1999. The development of social capital. *Ration. Soc.* 11(1):79–110
- Hofferth SL, Stanhope S, Mullan Harris K. 2005. Remaining off welfare in the 1990s: the influence of public policy and economic conditions. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 34(2):426–53
- Hofferth SL, Stanhope S, Mullan Harris K. 2002. Exiting welfare in the 1990s: Did public policy influence recipients' behavior? *Popul. Res. Policy Rev.* 21(5):433–72

- House JS, Juster FT, Kahn RL, eds. 2004. *A Telescope on Society: Survey Research & Social Science at the University of Michigan & Beyond*. Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. Mich. Press
- Hsin A. 2009. Parent's time with children: Does time matter for children's cognitive achievement? *Soc. Indic. Res.* 93(1):123-26
- Hunter LM, Boardman JD, Saint Onge JM. 2005. The association between natural amenities, rural population growth, and long-term residents' economic well-being. *Rural Sociol.* 70(4):452-70
- Jackson MI, Mare RD. 2007. Cross-sectional and longitudinal measurements of neighborhood experience and their effects on children. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 36(2):590-610
- Johnson DS, McGonagle KA, Freedman VA, Sastry N. 2018. Longitudinal research on social dynamics: the PSID at 50 years. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci.* 680(1):1-259
- Killewald A. 2013. Return to being black, living in the red: a race gap in wealth that goes beyond social origins. *Demography* 50(4):1177-95
- Killewald A. 2016. Money, work, and marital stability: assessing change in the gendered determinants of divorce. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 81(4):696-719
- Kravitz-Wirtz N, Crowder K, Hajat A, Sass V. 2016. The long-term dynamics of racial/ethnic inequality in neighborhood air pollution exposure, 1990-2009. *Bois Rev. Soc. Sci. Res. Race.* 13(2):237-59
- Lareau A, Weininger E. 2008. Time, work, and family life: reconceptualizing gendered time patterns through the case of children's organized activities. *Sociol. Forum.* 23(3):419-54
- Lichter DT, Parisi D, Taquino MC. 2017. Together but apart: Do US whites live in racially diverse cities and neighborhoods? *Popul. Dev. Rev.* 43(2):229-55
- Lopoo LM, DeLeire T. 2014. Family structure and the economic wellbeing of children in youth and adulthood. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 43:30-44
- Maralani V. 2013. The demography of social mobility: black-white differences in the process of educational reproduction. *Am. J. Sociol.* 118(6):1509-58
- Mare RD. 2011. A multigenerational view of inequality. *Demography* 48(1):1-23
- Martin IW, Beck K. 2015. Property tax limitation and racial inequality in effective tax rates. *Crit. Sociol.* 43(2):221-36
- Martin MA. 2003. The role of family income in the intergenerational association of AFDC receipt. *J. Marriage Fam.* 65(2):326
- Massey DS, Gross AB, Shibuya K. 1994. Migration, segregation, and the geographic concentration of poverty. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 59(3):425-45
- Massey DS, Shibuya K. 1995. Unraveling the tangle of pathology: the effect of spatially concentrated joblessness on the well-being of African Americans. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 24(4):352-66
- Maume DJ Jr. 1999. Glass ceilings and glass escalators: occupational segregation and race and sex differences in managerial promotions. *Work Occup.* 26(4):483-509
- Maume DJ Jr. 2004a. Wage discrimination over the life course: a comparison of explanations. *Soc. Probl.* 51(4):505-27
- Maume DJ Jr. 2004b. Is the glass ceiling a unique form of inequality? *Work Occup.* 31(2):250-74
- Maume DJ Jr. 1985. Government participation in the local economy and race- and sex-based earnings inequality. *Soc. Probl.* 32(3):285-99
- Mazumder B. 2016. Estimating the intergenerational elasticity and rank association in the United States: overcoming the current limitations of tax data. In *Inequality: Causes and Consequences*, ed. L. Cappellari, S. Polachek, K. Tatsiramos, pp. 83-129. Bingley, UK: Emerald
- Mazumder B. 2018. Intergenerational mobility in the United States: what we have learned from the PSID. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci.* 680(1):213-34
- McBrier DB, Wilson G. 2004. Going down? Race and downward occupational mobility for white-collar workers in the 1990s. *Work Occup.* 31(3):283-322
- McGonagle KA, Sastry N. 2015. Cohort profile: the Panel Study of Income Dynamics' Child Development Supplement and Transition into Adulthood Study. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 44(2):415-22
- McGonagle KA, Sastry N. 2016. Using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics to analyze housing decisions, dynamics, and effects. *Cityscape J. Policy Dev. Res.* 18(1):226-40
- McGonagle KA, Schoeni RF, Sastry N, Freedman VA. 2012. The Panel Study of Income Dynamics: overview, recent innovations, and potential for life course research. *Longitud. Life Course Stud.* 3(2):268-84

- McLanahan S. 1983. Family structure and stress: a longitudinal comparison of male and female-headed families. *J. Marriage Fam.* 45(2):347–57
- McLanahan S. 1985. Family structure and the reproduction of poverty. *Am. J. Sociol.* 90(4):873–901
- McLanahan S. 1988. Family structure and dependency: early transitions to female household headship. *Demography* 25(1):1–16
- McLanahan S, Bumpass L. 1988. Intergenerational consequences of family disruption. *Am. J. Sociol.* 94(1):130–52
- McManus PA, DiPrete TA. 2001. Losers and winners: the financial consequences of separation and divorce for men. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 66(2):246–68
- Meschede T, Thomas H, Mann A, Stagg A, Shapiro T. 2016. Wealth mobility of families raising children in the twenty-first century. *Race Soc. Probl.* 8(1):77–92
- Milkie MA, Nomaguchi KM, Denny KE. 2015. Does the amount of time mothers spend with children or adolescents matter? *J. Marriage Fam.* 77(2):355–72
- Mitnik PA, Bryant V, Weber M. 2019. The intergenerational transmission of family-income advantages in the United States. *Sociol. Sci.* 6:380–415
- Mitnik PA, Bryant V, Weber M, Grusky DB. 2015. *New estimates of intergenerational income mobility using administrative data*. Rep., Joint Stat. Res. Program, Intern. Revenue Serv.
- Moffitt R, Schoeni RF, Brown CC, Chase-Lansdale L, Couper MP, et al. 2015. Assessing the need for a new nationally representative household panel survey in the United States. *J. Econ. Soc. Meas.* 40:1–26
- Mohanty LL, Raut LK. 2009. Home ownership and school outcomes of children: evidence from the PSID Child Development Supplement. *Am. J. Econ. Sociol.* 68(2):465–89
- Morgan JN, Smith JD. 1969a. *A Report on Research in Process Under Contract to the Office of Economic Opportunity*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich.
- Morgan JN, Smith JD. 1969b. *Study Design, Procedures, and Forms, 1968 Interviewing Year (Wave I)*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich.
- Mueller C. 1989. Particularism in authority outcomes of black and white supervisors. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 18(1):1–20
- Ono H. 1998. Husbands' and wives' resources and marital dissolution. *J. Marriage Fam.* 60(3):674–89
- Parcel TL. 1979. Race, regional labor markets and earnings. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 44:262–79
- Parcel TL. 1982. Wealth accumulation of black and white men: the case of housing equity. *Soc. Probl.* 30(2):199–211
- Perkins KL. 2019. Changes in household composition and children's educational attainment. *Demography* 56:525–48
- Pfeffer FT. 2014. Multigenerational approaches to social mobility: a multifaceted research agenda. *Res. Soc. Stratif. Mobil.* 1(35):1–12
- Pfeffer FT. 2018. Growing wealth gaps in education. *Demography* 55(3):1033–68
- Pfeffer FT, Danziger S, Schoeni RF. 2013. Wealth disparities before and after the Great Recession. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci.* 650(1):98–123
- Pfeffer FT, Killewald A. 2018. Generations of advantage: multigenerational correlations in family wealth. *Soc. Forces* 96(4):1411–42
- Pfeffer FT, Killewald A. 2019. Intergenerational wealth mobility and racial inequality. *Socius*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023119831799>
- Presser HB. 1998. Decapitating the U.S. Census Bureau's "head of household": feminist mobilization in the 1970s. *Fem. Econ.* 4(3):145–58
- Prix I, Pfeffer FT. 2017. Does Donald need Uncle Scrooge? Extended family wealth and children's educational attainment in the United States. In *Social Inequality Across the Generations: The Role of Compensation and Multiplication in Resource Accumulation*, ed. J Erola, E Kilpi, pp. 112–35. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar
- PSID (Panel Study Income Dyn.). 1968. *Study of Family Economics*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich.
- PSID (Panel Study Income Dyn.). 2019a. *A Panel Study of Income Dynamics: 1968-2017 Relationship Matrix File Documentation*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich.
- PSID (Panel Study Income Dyn.). 2019b. *PSID Main Interview User Manual: Release 2019*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inst. Soc. Res., Univ. Mich.
- Quillian L. 2002. Why is black-white residential segregation so persistent? Evidence on three theories from migration data. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 31(2):197–229

- Rank MR. 2009. Measuring the economic racial divide across the course of American lives. *Race Soc. Probl.* 1(2):57–66
- Rank MR, Hirschl TA. 1999. The economic risk of childhood in America: estimating the probability of poverty across the formative years. *J. Marriage Fam.* 61(4):1058–67
- Ren C. 2019. Fluctuating courses and constant challenges: the two trajectories of black-white earnings inequality, 1968–2015. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 77:30–44
- Rexroat C, Shehan C. 1987. The family life cycle and spouses' time in housework. *J. Marriage Fam.* 49(4):737–50
- Roksa J, Patter D. 2011. Parenting and academic achievement: intergenerational transmission of educational advantage. *Sociol. Educ.* 84(4):299–321
- Saint Onge JM, Hunter LM, Boardman JD. 2007. Population growth in high-amenity rural areas: Does it bring socioeconomic benefits for long-term residents? *Soc. Sci. Q.* 88(2):366–81
- Sandberg JF, Hofferth SL. 2001. Changes in children's time with parents, U.S. 1981–1997. *Demography* 38(8):423–36
- Sastry N, Fomby P, McGonagle K. 2018. Using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) to conduct life course health development analysis. In *Handbook of Life Course Health Development*, pp. 579–99. New York: Springer
- Sastry N, McGonagle KA, Schoeni RF. 2009. Introduction to the special issue on the scientific assessment of biometrics in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. *Biodemography Soc. Biol.* 55(2):113–17
- Schneider D, Harknett K, Stimpson M. 2018. What explains the decline in first marriage in the United States? Evidence from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, 1969 to 2013. *J. Marriage Fam.* 80(4):791–811
- Schoeni RF, Bianchi SM, Hotz J, Selzer JA, Wiemers EE. 2015. Intergenerational transfers and extended family roster: a new substudy of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. *Longitud. Life Course Stud.* 6(3):319–30
- Schoeni RF, Buchmueller TC, Freedman V. 2011. Socioeconomic status and health over the life course and across generations: introduction to a special issue and overview of a unique data resource. *B.E. J. Econ. Anal. Policy* 11(3):3444–53
- Schwartz CR, Gonalons-Pons P. 2016. Trends in relative earnings and marital dissolution: Are wives who outearn their husbands still more likely to divorce? *RSF* 2(4):218–36
- Seltzer JA. 2019. Family change and changing family demography. *Demography* 56(2):405–26
- Seltzer JA, Bachrach CA, Bianchi SM, Bledsoe CH, Casper LM, et al. 2005. Explaining family change and variation: challenges for family demographers. *J. Marriage Fam.* 67(4):908–25
- Sharkey P. 2008. The intergenerational transmission of context. *Am. J. Sociol.* 113(4):931–69
- Sharkey P, Elwert F. 2011. The legacy of disadvantage: multigenerational neighborhood effects on cognitive ability. *Am. J. Sociol.* 116(6):1934–81
- Sharp G, Hall M. 2014. Emerging forms of racial inequality in homeownership exit, 1968–2009. *Soc. Probl.* 61(3):427–47
- Smith J, Morgan JN. 1970. Dynamics of income distribution: poverty and progress: variability of economic well-being and its determinants. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 60(2):286–95
- Solon G. 1992. Intergenerational income mobility in the United States. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 82(3):393–408
- Song X, Mare RD. 2015. Prospective versus retrospective approaches to the study of intergenerational social mobility. *Sociol. Methods Res.* 44(4):555–84
- Song X, Mare RD. 2017. Short-term and long-term educational mobility of families: a two-sex approach. *Demography* 54(1):145–73
- Sorensen AB, Fuerst S. 1978. Black-white differences in the occurrence of job shifts. *Sociol. Soc. Res.* 62(4):537–57
- South SJ. 2001. Time-dependent effects of wives' employment on marital dissolution. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 66(2):226–45
- South SJ, Crowder KD. 1997. Escaping distressed neighborhoods: individual, community and metropolitan influences. *Am. J. Sociol.* 103(1):1040–84
- South SJ, Crowder KD. 1998. Avenues and barriers to residential mobility among single mothers. *J. Marriage Fam.* 60(4):866–77

- South SJ, Crowder KD. 2005. Exiting and entering high-poverty neighborhoods: Latinos, blacks and Anglos compared. *Soc. Forces* 84(2):873-900
- South SJ, Crowder KD. 2010. Neighborhood poverty and nonmarital fertility: spatial and temporal dimensions. *J. Marriage Fam.* 72(1):89-104
- South SJ, Crowder KD, Pais J. 2008. Inter-neighborhood migration and spatial assimilation in a multi-ethnic world: comparing Latinos, blacks and Anglos. *Soc. Forces* 87(1):415-45
- Taylor J, Meschede T. 2018. Inherited prospects: the importance of financial transfers for white and black college-educated households' wealth trajectories. *Am. J. Econ. Sociol.* 77(3-4):1049-76
- Thomas H, Mann A, Meschede T. 2018. Race and location: the role neighborhoods play in family wealth and well-being. *Am. J. Econ. Sociol.* 77(3-4):1077-111
- Timberlake JM. 2007. Racial and ethnic inequality in the duration of children's exposure to neighborhood poverty and affluence. *Soc. Probl.* 54(3):319-42
- Torche F. 2011. Is a college degree still the great equalizer? Intergenerational mobility across levels of schooling in the United States. *Am. J. Sociol.* 117(3):763-807
- Torche F. 2015. Analyses of intergenerational mobility: an interdisciplinary review. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci.* 657(1):37-62
- US Census Bur. 1970. *Guide to the documentation and data files of the 1966 and 1967 Survey of Economic Opportunity*. Rep., Inst. Res. Poverty, Univ. Wis.
- US Census Bur. 1968. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1968*. Washington, DC: US Census Bur.
- US Census Bur. 1999. *Nativity of the population and place of birth of the native population: 1850 to 1990*. Tech. Pap. 29, US Census Bur., Washington, DC
- US Census Bur. 2017. *Table DP02: 2016 American Community Survey 1-year estimates*. Selected Social Characteristics in the United States: US Census Bur., Washington, DC, updated Aug. 29. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>
- Wagmiller RL Jr., Lennon MC, Kuang L, Alberti PM Jr., Aber JL. 2006. The dynamics of economic disadvantage and children's life chances. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 71(5):847-66
- Weininger EB, Lareau A, Conley D. 2015. What money doesn't buy: class resources and children's participation in organized extracurricular activities. *Soc. Forces* 94(2):479-503
- Weiss RS. 1984. The impact of marital dissolution on income and consumption in single-parent households. *J. Marriage Fam.* 46(1):115-27
- Wiemers EE, Seltzer JA, Schoeni RF, Hotz VJ, Bianchi SM. 2019. Stepfamily structure and transfers between generations in U.S. families. *Demography* 56(1):229-60
- Wightman P, Danziger S. 2014. Multi-generational income disadvantage and the educational attainment of young adults. *Res. Soc. Stratif. Mobil.* 35:53-69
- Williams Shanks TR. 2007. The impacts of household wealth on child development. *J. Poverty* 11:93-116
- Williams Shanks TR, Destin M. 2009. Parental expectations and educational outcomes for young African American adults: Do household assets matter? *Race Soc. Probl.* 1(1):27-35
- Wilson G. 1997. Payoffs to power among males in the middle class: Has race declined in its significance? *Sociol. Q.* 38(4):607-22
- Wilson G. 2009. Downward mobility of women from white-collar employment: determinants and timing by race. *Sociol. Forum.* 24(2):382-401
- Wilson G, Maume D. 2014. Men's mobility into management from blue collar and white collar jobs: race differences across the early career years. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 46:117-29
- Wilson G, McBrier D. 2005. Race and loss of privilege: African American/white differences in the determinants of job layoffs from upper-tier occupations. *Sociol. Forum.* 20(2):301-21
- Wilson G, Petersen N, Smith R, Maume D. 2019. Particularism and racial mobility into privileged occupations. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 78:82-94
- Wilson G, Roscigno VJ. 2010. Race and downward mobility from privileged occupations: African American/white dynamics across the early work-career. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 39(1):67-77
- Wilson G, Roscigno VJ, Huffman ML. 2013. Public sector transformation, racial inequality and downward occupational mobility. *Soc. Forces* 91(3):975-1006

- Wilson G, Roscigno VJ, Huffman M. 2015. Racial income inequality and public sector privatization. *Soc. Probl.* 62(2):163–85
- Wilson G, Sakura-Lemessy I. 2000. Earnings over the early work career among males in the middle class: Has race declined in its significance? *Sociol. Perspect.* 43(1):159–71
- Wilson G, Sakura-Lemessy I, West JP. 1999. Reaching the top: racial differences in mobility paths to upper-tier occupations. *Work Occup.* 26(2):165–86
- Wilson WJ. 1978. *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Wilson WJ. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Wodtke GT, Elwert F, Harding DJ. 2016. Neighborhood effect heterogeneity by family income and developmental period. *Am. J. Sociol.* 121(4):1168–222
- Wodtke GT, Harding DJ, Elwert F. 2011. Neighborhood effects in temporal perspective: the impact of long-term exposure to concentrated disadvantage on high school graduation. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 76(5):713–36
- Wodtke GT, Parbst M. 2017. Neighborhoods, schools, and academic achievement: a formal mediation analysis of contextual effects on reading and mathematics abilities. *Demography* 54(4):1653–76
- Wright EO. 1978. Race, class and income inequality. *Am. J. Sociol.* 83(6):1368–97
- Wright EO, ed. 1979. *Class Structure and Income Determination*. New York: Academic
- Yetis-Bayraktar A, Budig MJ, Tomaskovic-Devey D. 2013. From the shop floor to the kitchen floor: maternal occupational complexity and children's reading and math skills. *Work Occup.* 40(1):37–64
- Zick CD, Smith KR. 1991. Marital transitions, poverty, and gender differences in mortality. *J. Marriage Fam.* 53:327–36



Contents

Prefatory Article

My Life in Words and Numbers
Samuel H. Preston 1

Of Modernity and Public Sociology: Reflections on a Career So Far
Claude S. Fischer 19

Theory and Methods

Advances in the Science of Asking Questions
Nora Cate Schaeffer and Jennifer Dykema 37

Computational Social Science and Sociology
Achim Edelmann, Tom Wolff, Danielle Montagne, and Christopher A. Bail 61

The Longitudinal Revolution: Sociological Research at the 50-Year
Milestone of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics
Fabian T. Pfeffer, Paula Fomby, and Noura Insolera 83

Tracking US Social Change Over a Half-Century: The General Social
Survey at Fifty
Peter V. Marsden, Tom W. Smith, and Michael Hout 109

Social Processes

Climate Change and Society
Thomas Dietz, Rachael L. Shwom, and Cameron T. Whitley 135

Social Networks and Cognition
*Edward Bishop Smith, Raina A. Brands, Matthew E. Brashears,
and Adam M. Kleinbaum* 159

Institutions and Culture

The Comparative Politics of Collective Memory
Geneviève Zubrzycki and Anna Woźny 175

Why Sociology Matters to Race and Biosocial Science <i>Dorothy E. Roberts and Oliver Rollins</i>	195
 Formal Organizations	
Employer Decision Making <i>Lauren A. Rivera</i>	215
 Political and Economic Sociology	
Organizations and the Governance of Urban Poverty <i>Nicole P. Marwell and Shannon L. Morrissey</i>	233
Relational Work in the Economy <i>Nina Bandelj</i>	251
What Do Platforms Do? Understanding the Gig Economy <i>Steven Vallas and Juliet B. Schor</i>	273
 Differentiation and Stratification	
Black Immigrants and the Changing Portrait of Black America <i>Tod G. Hamilton</i>	295
Immigrant Selectivity Effects on Health, Labor Market, and Educational Outcomes <i>Cynthia Feliciano</i>	315
Multiracial Categorization, Identity, and Policy in (Mixed) Racial Formations <i>Kimberly A. DaCosta</i>	335
Race/Ethnicity over Fifty Years of Structural Differentiation in K–12 Schooling: Period-Specific and Life-Course Perspectives <i>Samuel R. Lucas, Santiago J. Molina, and John M. Towey</i>	355
The Impact of Inequality on Intergenerational Mobility <i>Thomas A. DiPrete</i>	379
Transnational Professionals <i>Brooke Harrington and Leonard Seabrooke</i>	399
 Individual and Society	
Class Position and Political Opinion in Rich Democracies <i>Arvid Lindh and Leslie McCall</i>	419

Contemporary Social Movements in a Hybrid Media Environment <i>Neal Caren, Kenneth T. Andrews, and Todd Lu</i>	443
Norms: An Integrated Framework <i>Christine Horne and Stefanie Mollborn</i>	467
The Sociology of Creativity: Elements, Structures, and Audiences <i>Frédéric Godart, Sorah Seong, and Damon J. Phillips</i>	489
Demography	
Migration Patterns in East and Southeast Asia: Causes and Consequences <i>Eric Fong and Kumiko Shibuya</i>	511
Return Migration Around the World: An Integrated Agenda for Future Research <i>Jacqueline Maria Hagan and Joshua Thomas Wassink</i>	533
Sociology, Genetics, and the Coming of Age of Sociogenomics <i>Melinda C. Mills and Felix C. Troupf</i>	553
Technologies and Health Inequities <i>Stefan Timmermans and Rebecca Kaufman</i>	583
Urban and Rural Community Sociology	
Cities of the Global South <i>AbdouMaliq Simone</i>	603
Urban Mobility and Activity Space <i>Kathleen A. Cagney, Erin York Cornwell, Alyssa W. Goldman, and Liang Cai</i>	623
Policy	
Sociology and the Climate Crisis <i>Eric Klinenberg, Malcolm Araos, and Liz Koslov</i>	649
The Social Consequences of Disasters: Individual and Community Change <i>Mariana Arcaya, Ethan J. Raker, and Mary C. Waters</i>	671
Sociology and World Regions	
Violence in Latin America: An Overview of Research and Issues <i>Carlos Vilalta</i>	693