

Table 1. A Closer look at the 2,333 NLSY respondents who exclusively or partially self-identified to the interviewer as "Black" in 2002 (Racial Identity Changers from 1979 are [Highlighted](#))

	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Black Racial/Ethnic Identity in 1979</u>		
Answered exclusively "Black"	2,147	92.03%
Answered partially "Black"	97	4.16%
<u>Single Non-Black Racial/Ethnic Identity in 1979</u>		
Answered exclusively "English"	38	1.63%
Answered exclusively of Hispanic Origin	13	0.56%
Answered exclusively "Indian-American or Native American" or "American"	12	0.51%
Answered exclusively "None" or "Other"	8	0.34%
Answered exclusively "French"	4	0.17%
Answered exclusively "Filipino" or "Asian Indian"	2	0.09%
Answered exclusively "Portuguese"	1	0.04%
<u>Multiple Non-Black Racial/Ethnic Identities in 1979</u>		
Answered partially "Indian-American or Native American"	4	0.17%
Answered partially "Other"	3	0.13%
Answered partially of Hispanic Origin	1	0.04%
<u>Missing Data</u>		
Skipped or refused to answer any 1979 racial self-identity questions	3	0.13%

Table 2. Among the 38 youth that exclusively identified as “English” in 1979 and then switched to “Black” in 2002, how did the respondent’s legal guardian initially describe the youth’s ethnicity?

<u>Parent or Guardian’s View of Respondent Race in 1978</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
% Identifying Respondent as “English, Scottish, or Welsh”	0	00.00%
% Identifying Respondent as “Another group, not listed”	2	05.26%
% Identifying Respondent as “Black, Negro, African American”	36	94.74%

Conclusion: The NLSY79 respondents that changed from a non-black to black self-identity from 1979 to 2002 constitute a very small group that is clearly not representative of the general population. One characteristic of those that change that makes them distinctly unrepresentative is that they overwhelmingly *started off* with inconsistent data (e.g., a mismatch between how their legal guardians define them and how they define themselves).

Table 3. Logistic Regression Estimates of the Relationship between Incarceration History and Black Self-identification in 2002 Under Different Assumptions About Incarceration-driven Fluidity versus Random Measurement Error

Variable	Estimates controlling for the original Black in 1979 measure used by S&P to model incarceration-driven fluidity	Estimates controlling for a created Black in 1979 measure that is different from Black in 2002 only by 1.6% induced random error
Ever Incarcerated	1.06** (0.34)	1.41*** (0.25)
Black Self-id in 1979	8.19*** (0.20)	6.64*** (0.13)
N	7,718	7,718

Notes: ** and *** indicate $p < .01$ and $p < .001$ respectively. Standard errors are in parentheses. The same percentage of the sample (1.6%) had a discrepancy in Black racial identification for 1979 vs. 2002 in both the original and the altered NLSY79 data. S&P refers to: Saperstein, Aliya and Andrew M. Penner. 2010. "The Race of a Criminal Record: How Incarceration Colors Racial Perceptions." *Social Problems* 57(1): 92-113.

Conclusion: The strategy of controlling for racial categorization in an earlier time period is unhelpful as a means for uncovering whether incarceration changes a person's race. Finding a robust incarceration estimate in the original data does not mean that an incarceration record drives racial change. An equivalent estimate for incarceration emerges when, by design, any racial change is entirely driven by random error.