

FINAL

**ETHNOGRAPHIC EVALUATION OF THE
1990 DECENNIAL CENSUS REPORT SERIES**

REPORT #21

**COVERAGE DIFFERENCES IN A MIXED NEIGHBORHOOD
IN HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT**

Final Report for Joint Statistical Agreement 89-35

October 1992

Submitted by:

**Nawal Ammar
Principal Investigator
The Institute for Community Research
Hartford, Connecticut 06105**

Peter Wobus, Technical Representative

This research was supported by a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Bureau of the Census. The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the author and should not be construed as an official Bureau of the Census position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

SECTION I: SITE PROFILE

1. The Larger Community

Hartford, the fourth poorest city in the country, is the capital of Connecticut, one of the wealthiest states in the country. Like other Northeastern cities, the economic, social, and physical infrastructure has not kept pace with the changing demands of the increasingly specialized service sector economy of insurance companies.

"Block 21", the subject of this report, lies in a neighborhood where both African-Americans and Puerto Ricans live. Tobacco farms first attracted African-American migrants from the south beginning in the early 1900's. As this population moved into the industrial sector, migrants from the Caribbean area (especially from Jamaica and the West Indies) also came to Hartford. Following World War II, new migrants arrived from Puerto Rico. Many of them later brought their families and settled in this area. Hartford experienced a brief decline in in-migration during the 1950's, but the decline reversed during the 1970's when foreign middle-class professionals, pushed by deteriorating conditions in their own countries, came large numbers to the U.S. The increased in-migration during the 1970's, suburbanization, the decline in tobacco agriculture, the proximity of Hartford to New York City and the growing dependence of the Hartford economy on the insurance service sector have all intertwined to create pressures on the inner-city residents of Hartford.

The ethnographic site is located in Hartford's oldest neighborhood. According to the 1980 Census, the population of the tract containing the study block was 7,595 (5.6 percent of Hartford's population). As is characteristic of many middle-sized, Northeastern cities, housing is segregated mostly by race and income rather than by ethnicity. Thus, African-American, Puerto Rican, West Indian, and other populations reside in the same buildings and on the same blocks, and frequently engage in various sorts of social interaction. According to the 1980 Census, the residents of the neighborhood were predominantly African-American/Black (53 percent) or Puerto Rican (43 percent). Most were poor (53 percent of the families have incomes below the poverty line) and they typically rent rather than own their place of residence (93 percent renting). The neighborhood's unemployment figures from the 1980 Census were also very high, and this continues today. A 1989 survey in this neighborhood found that 49 percent of the neighborhood's adult residents were unemployed, and most who were employed were between the ages of 46 to 64. The neighborhood is also characterized by a large number of female-headed households who are unemployed (67 percent).¹ The sale and distribution of illicit drugs is widespread and constitutes an important alternative source of income.

¹ These 1989 figures were taken from the "Clay Arsenal Neighborhood Profile", published by the Institute for Community Research in Hartford.

2. Block 21

The block is a typical city census block, uninterrupted by natural or human-made boundaries (e.g., water or railroad tracks). Almost rectangular in shape the block contains primarily residential units. There are, however, three empty lots, a bar that opens after 6:00 p.m. and a pizza/grinder shop that is normally open from 11:00 a.m. till 6:00 or 7:00 p.m.

The primary language of most residents in the block is English; six residents speak only Spanish. St. Lucian and Jamaican Creole, in addition to English, are also spoken by some residents. According to our field research, roughly 70 percent of this population is African American, 20 percent is Puerto Rican, and 10 percent are West Indian.² The block is largely insulated from the watchfulness of neighbors on adjacent blocks. Its isolation provides more favorable conditions for drug and other illegal activities.

Block 21 changes its face according to the time of day, day of week, and the season. In the morning between 8:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m., two of the streets (the south and the north) are bustling with activity. Men often congregate on the empty lots outside the block boundaries. On the southern border the congregants tend to be African-American males over 35 years of age who live in a rooming house. One often sees them talking, drinking, and laughing together there, especially on warmer days. The rooms in the rooming house are small and have one window. Since most houses in the northeast are built to preserve heat, remaining inside during days in which the temperature exceeds 55 degrees is uncomfortable.

This street after 12:30 p.m. is frequented by many people who buy pizza and sandwiches at the grinder store. At this point the rooming house residents come together in front of their "three-family house" and move away from the empty lot. We were told that after 8:00 p.m. the street is also frequented by people who come to the bar to drink and dance. The research team could not substantiate this with actual field-work observations, since the latest we were on the block was 7:30 p.m..

The team also found the northern border of the block bustling with older, African-American men. The average age of this group appeared, however, to be older than those found on the southern street; we estimate that the average age of members of that group to be 45 years or older. These men are not all residents of the block; some also gather near the package store from surrounding blocks. This group is less noisy than the one that gathers on the southern street, and is not as transient in the neighborhood. In the evening (after 5:00 p.m.), on warm days, this group of men is replaced by a younger group of men (we estimate to be between 20 and 35 years of age) who gather in the front yard of one of the three-family houses. We often saw people of this group drinking and smoking. After 2:00 p.m., police activity on the street increases. Typically police officers park outside the block, but we sometimes

² Despite seven weeks of field work, we are reluctant to offer more precise figures on this score. For 46 (of 121) households we were unable to identify the race and national origin of household members.

spotted them walking and standing on the street (and made considerable effort to avoid them).

The western border of the block contains mostly residential units. In the mornings it is quite quiet and shows little activity on the street. We sometimes found a couple of youths (probably teenagers) sitting in front of and apparently guarding one of the houses (we strongly suspect the house is a center for drug dealing). One also sees on this street (and on the north street) graffiti on the walls which indicate the presence of gangs. The gang name that frequents this block is called "DEVIL". The Nazi swastika symbol is seen repeatedly on the walls, especially near the areas where drug consumption and exchange occurs. Other graffiti include names of women enclosed inside hearts and "The Temple of Doom". Again, police activity increases during the afternoon; officers frequently walk the street appearing to intentionally remind onlookers of their authority and the weapons they carry to enforce it.

The east street is mostly quiet. Only in the afternoons does some illicit activity spill over from the south street to the corner of the east. Overall, the public and private consumption of alcohol is a commonly observed and accepted activity on block 21. Discarded empty liquor bottles of various sorts and sizes are an often seen on the street, especially on the southern and northern streets of the block. While we saw no evidence of needles for intra-venous drug use, the consumption and exchange of illegal drugs seems part of the block's culture. While we don't believe that most residents engage in or approve of this activity, it seems that the influence of drug trafficking has had an impact on the area that is disproportionate to the number of people who actually participate. To some extent residents expressed a general fear and suspicion, not just of our research team, but also of their own neighbors. The announcement of a neighborhood watch meeting is additional evidence that crime (probably drug-related) is an important issue in the neighborhood. Finally, the visible presence of police officers seems to symbolize the collective insecurity that largely characterizes this block. Nonetheless, most residents appear to go about their daily activity with a semblance of order and precarious routine. We heard of no tragic incidents occurring during the several weeks of our field work. During the day time, at least, activity for most residents was what one might consider typical of many over-crowded and impoverished urban areas.

SECTION II: METHODOLOGY

1. Research Team

The field methods in this project relied mainly on observations recorded on a data form. A team of four researchers (including the PI and the Institute's Data Manager) carried out the Alterative Enumeration (AE) and behavioral observations. The team was composed of people with backgrounds that connected them to the community. One of the field assistants was an African-American who attended high school in the area and lives near by. The other field assistant is a Puerto Rican woman who is fluent in Spanish and works for the Institute for Community Research.

2. Training

The community research team was trained on terms of reference for the Alternative Enumeration (AE) provided by the Center for Survey Methods Research. There were four training sessions. These involved clarifying the project aims and developing ethnographic and survey skills. A system of enumerating buildings and households was devised by the Data Manager of the Institute.³ The enumeration was devised for the larger Rapid Sociodemographic Assessment (RSA) survey research project conducted by the Institute. A data form was used that listed entries for street numbers, street names, building type, unit number, person number and remarks.

After four sessions of training the research team went out to block 21 in Hartford, almost every day for nearly seven weeks. We visited each household that we were able to contact at least seven times to compile the necessary information. Eighty percent of the households in block 21 were contacted directly. Information was obtained primarily from the neighbors of those who could not be contacted directly.

3. Coding and Analysis

The Alternative Enumeration was "coded" by a 5th person (under the partial supervision of the PI). During the last week of July, the PI relocated outside of Hartford, CT. This initiated a decision by the Institute's director to code the AE within a week. In October 1990 the PI reviewed the coding and presented CSMR with the Alternative Enumeration. In December 1990, the research team returned to the field to "resolve" discrepancies between the census enumeration and the AE. The team at this point consisted of the PI and two other community researchers. In order to apply the codes, several rounds of clarification were transacted between the PI and the Census Bureau technical representative.

4. Rationale for Choosing Block 21

The Institute for Community Research conducted a Rapid Sociodemographic Assessment in the city of Hartford during 1988-1990. This project collected demographic, social, economic, health and other data on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis. The data form was constructed to record census-like information as well as the socio-cultural characteristics of the respondents. During the pilot phase of this project, block 21 had a large non-response rate relative to the rest of the census tracts surveyed. The overall response rate for this neighborhood was 75 percent. By comparison, block 21's response rate was 63.3 percent. This comparatively low response rate was obtained despite repeated visits (sometimes over seven times), numerous changes in interviewers due to language barriers, and a general discomfort felt with interviewing in the area. The assessment of these factors (especially the repeated visits to the households in the block) informed our selection of this particularly troublesome area to survey.

³He is Dr. Robert Weaver, currently Assistant Professor of Sociology at Youngstown State University, Ohio.

5. Dates of the Alternative Enumeration and Follow-Up Field Work

The dates of Alternative Enumeration and follow-up field work were:
Alternative Enumeration Dates: May 1-June 14, 1990
Follow-Up Field Work: December 18-22, 1990

6. Hypothesis

The original hypothesis guiding this research proposed that disproportionately more Blacks and Puerto Rican Hispanics than other residents would be missed by the census because residents of these racial and ethnic sub groups: (1) distrust outsiders, (2) have unusual housing arrangements, (3) and/or have transient individuals who temporarily reside with the household.

SECTION III: A GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF OMISSIONS AND ERRORS

A general comparison of the AE and the census shows that in several cases people were missed from the census or the AE within the same household. It is our contention that people were missed in both counts due to the unusual composition of the households, deliberate concealment, research reactivity, difficulty of enumerating housing units on the block, and to a lesser extent cultural reporting of children.

Research reactivity may have been a factor in households containing people who were missed by the census or the AE that were correctly identified by the census and the AE as occupied. The census enumerator and the AE research team were at the ethnographic site at almost the same time in May and June. Information collected for the AE appeared to be more easily obtained from households that had not yet been contacted by the census. In many cases, the census records of households enumerated by the census after the AE were different or less complete. However, precise evidence of reactivity could not be ascertained with certainty.

The census listed 142 housing units, not all of which existed. In several cases the error in the census count resulted from missed households. The census, for example, missed the following households A062, A063, A064, A076 located in a mixed-use building. The building was hard to enumerate. The mail carrier said that this was a commercial address, but there are clearly four housing units. One typically found the occupants during hot days when they opened the back door of the commercial unit to sit outside.

There were also other cases where the census identified housing units on the block that did not exist. For example, census records B342, B359, B367, B375, B383, B391 are addresses of an empty lot with no housing units. Other sources of error are duplicate records. For example census record B565 is a duplicate of record B581 (matched with household A050).

The AE found 121 housing units (HUs) on this block, situated in diverse types of buildings. The most common type of housing on this block is the three-family house. Eleven (11) housing units on block 21 are owner-occupied. These units included two single-family homes, three landlord occupancies, and six condominium units. The owners of these units are African-Americans and immigrants from the Caribbean area. Most (110) of the units in block 21, however, are rented. The large number of rental units explains, in part, the problematic nature of enumerating this block. In the city of Hartford in general, and in this neighborhood in particular, a disproportionate amount of income is spent on rent. The revival and renovation of the nearby central business district during the 1980s resulted in an increase in the land value and housing costs. In 1989, the average renter in this neighborhood who did not receive rent subsidies or live in public housing, spent 67 percent of his/her income on non-subsidized housing. The block includes 10 public housing units and at least six others where monthly rent is subsidized. Even occupants of subsidized housing spent between 22 and 42 percent of their income on housing.⁴ Hence, many housing units shelter two or more families, often illegally, to combat these high housing costs. Further, housing costs remained high on this block, despite their deteriorating condition. Rent for apartments having four rooms ranges from \$450 to \$550 per month; the sales price for a town house condominium is, on average, about \$75,000. The cost of renting a single room (including heat and a communal bath) in a rooming house is about \$100 per week.

Problems in the list of housing on the census seemed to affect census enumeration, which was largely carried out door to door. In block 21, according to information keyed from census forms on the match report, the mail replies represent less than a quarter of the total population enumerated. The remainder (77 percent) were done by follow-up enumerator in May and June 1990. Mailboxes and addresses on the block are not usually clearly marked. In apartment buildings the mailboxes are inside and access to them is often difficult. Even when access is gained, however, the names on the mailboxes are often not clearly labeled. In Hartford, mail may not be distributed to mailboxes without names. Consequently, last names are frequently left on mailboxes to satisfy this rule. These names do not always coincide with all the names of the household members, however. To further complicate matters, some names on mailboxes are there for mail delivery only, and the person does not live in the unit. This is common practice in Hartford's poorer neighborhoods because city assistance programs often require residence in the city.

Qualitative Analysis:

1. TRANSIENTS AND UNUSUAL HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

The following are examples of households where census error occurred apparently because of the presence of transients in households or other forms of unusual household composition.

⁴ These 1989 figures were taken from the "Clay Arsenal Neighborhood Profile", published by the Institute for Community Research in Hartford.

Household A008: An upstairs neighbor referred to this household as "little Jamaica". The census and the AE both reported two Black males residing there but we determined that only one was there on Census Day. The Census Day resident was a long time resident and worked in the city. The other person was one of a number of younger men who live there while looking for a job and then move out. The transient had been living in the household from March until shortly before Census Day. When this household was enumerated by the census he was replaced by another young man. Most of these transients are related to the single long term member of the household. Their status as Census Day residents was difficult to ascertain. According to neighbors, from January through March, at least 3 different men had resided in this household.

Household A044: The census reported two people in this household, the AE only one. The person missing from the AE is the sister of the household head and was visiting, not resident during the census.

Household A049: The AE reports four people in this household, the census only two. The two people not listed in the census are nephews of the head of the household. The nephews are living with the householder but their names are not on the lease. The nephews are also foster children.

Household A055 : The census reported one more child in this household than the AE. We never encountered this extra child during the AE. Our follow up in December showed that this extra child was a boarder who was resident during the census, had moved out at the time of the AE and was not replaced. This household sent a mail reply by the end of March.

Household A059: The census reported one more household member than the AE. The extra person does not reside in the household or in the site. Rather, he stays there intermittently with his sister who does not speak English. His name is on the mail box and on the lease. He had responded to the census by mail return and erroneously included himself as a resident of the household.

2. CONCEALMENT AND DISTRUST OF OUTSIDERS

In these households concealment of household members and distrust of outsiders appear to be factors contributing to census error.

Household A010: The AE reported one person and the census reported two. This apartment is located in public housing where there are limits to the number of people allowed per apartment.

Household A013: The AE lists 5 names and the census lists 3. The woman argued with us maintaining that the questions we were asking were very private. She also did not allow us into her home. She refused to give us names but gave us the ages and marital status of household members. This is interesting because age and marital status are considered private by many people. The household is "ethnically" mixed (Hispanic and Black). The woman is the only adult. There are three names on the mail box. This household was present in May and in December.

Household A017: The AE reports six residents, the census reports three. The apartment is located in public housing where the number of occupants per unit is limited. Note that this is an Hispanic family and those not reported were children.

Household A038: The census enumerated this household as vacant, however the AE found three people living there. The household is composed of a female, her partner (reported as husband) and her biological child. We gained access to this woman through our Spanish speaking female team member. After a few tries we were able to ease her fear of talking with outsiders and collected the information from her.

Household A043: The AE found one person and the census two people. The census names do not match with those on the AE. The AE person is a young woman living alone in her apartment and was resident on Census Day. The people whose names appear on the census are her parents who live on a different block outside the ethnographic site. We assume that the enumerator had met her parents when they were visiting and, in an attempt to conceal that their daughter was living alone, reported themselves as residents. The young woman moved to a bigger apartment in November.

Household A087: The AE lists three names, while the census lists two person records with no names. We recorded the names from the mailbox. We were unable to contact the people in this unit (during the AE or followup in December). But in December we were told by neighbors that these people work a night shift and do not open their door in the morning for anybody. The neighbors also corrected the names we had in the first enumeration.

Household A001: The first time we talked with the people in this household, an older woman kept on saying to the woman talking to us: "Do not answer their questions, don't trust them". After a while, we had to reassure her that we would not do anything with the information that would harm her. We explained that we were there to check whether the government has been doing its job or not. This calmed residents somewhat. Three people were listed on the AE and on the census by mail return.

Household A002: We were unsuccessful the first time we attempted to contact this household. The second time when we were on the corner of the street near a group of women who were talking to each other one of the AE team members who knew a member of this group initiated a conversation with her. Another team member asked: "Do you know who lives in this unit?" The women replied: "I live there, why?" The researcher then proceeded to explain to her our reasons for asking and the woman reluctantly agreed to cooperate but only after one of the other women had said: "Oh you know Bert... you can help him". The second time we talked to this woman she was again reluctant, but cooperated, as she explained: "Only because Bert is with you... I know his mother... real well". A mother and her son are listed on the AE. Three persons, age and gender unknown, were reported to the census by mail return.

Household A007: A mother, two daughters and a son reside in a household enumerated by the census as vacant. We gained access to this household when a daughter was attracted to a ring worn by one of the researchers. With

amazement the girl asked: "Is this real?" The mother came to the street to call the daughter to enter the house. Only when she recognized one of our research team members and started talking to him were we invited in.

3. DIFFICULT TO ENUMERATE HOUSEHOLDS

Errors resulting from incorrect identification of housing units were most common in apartment buildings where access was also a problem. We found that the census had recorded five units in an apartment building containing six units. The AE made similar mistakes which took several weeks of field work to correct. Language was also a factor in seven households where there were people from Puerto Rico and the West Indies.

In the following households a variety of barriers were identified, including language, poorly labeled addresses and problems gaining access to buildings by nonresidents.

Household A023: Access to this household was difficult. It is located in an apartment building with locked glass doors and an intercom. Each time we entered the apartment building we were unable to contact directly the residents. Again, when we returned to this household in June to complete our enumeration, no one was available; the neighbors told us only that one person lived there. One person was listed on the census and the AE.

Household A032: This, too, was a difficult unit to access, located in the same apartment complex as A023. We were able to talk to the neighbors in May. They told us that there is a Black person in this unit who works odd hours. The census and AE recorded a single person at this household.

Household A045: The census and AE both counted one person in this household. We were unable to directly contact this person. The AE was based on information from neighbors. This is located in the same apartment building as A023 where access is especially difficult.

Household A098: This was listed on the AE as a single person household, based on information obtained from neighbors. There is no equivalent census record. Again, access was a problem. When I talked with the woman residing there she was particularly anxious about the crime rate in the neighborhood. She asked me specifically if "we were going to do anything about it". I replied: "I don't think our work will cause any immediate change". Her last comment was "then why do you do these things?".

Household A105: We were unable to directly contact anyone at this address. Two people were listed by the AE, one person by the census. Both names recorded on the AE were taken from the mailbox. The census record is without the person's name or demographic information. During followup in December, neighbors said that only one person lived there on Census Day.

Household A118: The AE identifies four occupants, as did the census. This was an easy household to enumerate. We first talked with residents on a cold May morning. The building's characteristics seemed to change as the weather became warm. Drinking, evidenced by small bottles in the front yard, and

illicit activities of some sort were taking place on the second floor. The census enumerated this building in June when there were people observed outside the building engaged in illicit activity.

Household A036: The street address recorded by the AE and census were correct but the apartment number listed by the census was not. The person listed on the AE lived in the housing unit in April and May. The person included in the census was there during June. In December still another person occupied the same housing unit. Hence, both the census and the resolution field work encountered in-movers who could not identify the housing unit occupants on Census Day.

Household A099: The AE and census each identify one occupant by name, but the names and sex do not match. This person was difficult to find at home. After making repeated visits to find this person, we were successful in December during follow-up. The name of the person reported on census is the same as the name on the mailbox for this housing unit. The census reported a male living there. The person who actually resided here Census Day was a female. She has not changed the name on the mailbox because, since it was a man's name, she felt safer. The mail carrier knows she lives there and delivers all her mail.

Household A108: The AE found a single person in this housing unit, the landlord whom the census apparently missed. On Census Day he was living here in a four unit apartment building that was under renovation. He gave us his census form to send in late May (we, of course, did send it for him) though I don't see any evidence of his existence on the census.

SECTION IV: CONCLUSION

This study is a step towards identifying the problems encountered when enumerating a block in a mid-sized Northeastern American inner city. During six weeks of field work in this census block, the field research team of four people was able to identify 121 units. Among these 105 were "Black" households, 15 were "Puerto Rican" and 1 was of mixed ethnicity. Behavioral explanations such as unusual household composition or variation in cultural factors explain the majority of the missed people in households included in the census (almost 63 percent of the cases). However, in my view too much importance is attributed to cultural explanations when methodological ones, particularly at this site, are significant. An equally important feature at this site is the quality and type of housing. Many census errors resulted from misidentifying housing units, particularly those in multi-unit buildings. In many cases, the census incorrectly identified apartment numbers. The addresses of some apartments, while clearly marked on the doors as "1", "2", or "3", were inexplicably listed on the census as, for instance, "102", "201", or "105" or as "B1", "B2", or "B3". Inconsistency in numbering may have contributed to the census double counting of some housing units. Other problems resulted when the census apparently copied incorrect names from mailboxes, and from the census' inability to differentiate between long-term visitors and residents. Training enumerators on the particularities of enumerating impoverished, urban areas where ethnically diverse populations reside seems critical if one hopes to gather accurate information.

The presence of two research teams eliciting the same information at different times is surely an important factor accounting for some of the differences between the AE and the census data. We call this "research reactivity". For instance, it is likely that repeated visits by separate researchers increased a feeling of distrust by the residents. The majority of the households in the ethnographic site were enumerated door-to-door in May and June. In retrospect, numerous visits by census enumerators and members of the research team appears to have affected both the AE and the census enumeration. In an area where concealment of overcrowding in rental and public housing units and distrust of strangers prevails, repeated efforts to obtain personal information (whether through the mail or from personal interviews by two separate outside research teams) in such a short period of time (from March to June) heightens feelings of suspicion. One neighbor and resident said: "There was a woman here earlier asking the same questions". Another asked me: "Is this a family business? Someone that looked like you came to ask the same questions". Despite our assurances to maintain confidentiality, respondents still seemed reluctant to provide information to a research team surveying soon after the census or to the census soon after the AE. Research reactivity alone probably explained attempts by many residents to obscure information. During our follow-up in December, the impact of research reactivity seemed to lessen. In December we found that residents were more willing to offer information about themselves and about household members. This suggests that the effects of research reactivity contributed to error in both the census and the AE. Hence, initial distrust elevated by repeated intrusions by outsiders contributes to the miscounting and misidentification of people in the two files.

Recommendations

Although a complete count of people living in areas with characteristics similar to block 21 can only be obtained by removing the structural barriers of poverty, overcrowding, drug activity, crime, and unemployment, the following few recommendations could improve the count:

1) Reduction of the censusing process to a singular type of inquiry. In an area where concealment of household members due to overcrowding and distrust of strangers, the intrusion of two methods of inquiry (one by mail and the other by a person knocking at the door) increases people's suspicion that they are being watched.

2) In cases of follow-up, it is preferable to deploy the same people who conducted the first enumeration. Being from the neighborhood or area and "looking like" the residents is not enough to gain trust. Establishing rapport between enumerator and neighbors significantly increased our ability to obtain accurate information. Also, since neighbors can assure each other that it is safe (or not) to answer the questions posed by enumerators, establishing continuity and rapport will elevate the feeling of trust residents might have.

3) The census should develop a systematic enumeration scheme and train enumerators to that scheme to enhance consistency and reduce redundancy when enumerating housing units. This is particularly important for multi-unit buildings. Housing units should more accurately reflect the "actual" numbers

on streets, buildings, mailboxes, and apartment units.

4) Collaboration between the Census Bureau and research organizations that know the basic problems of researching the area would also enhance the accuracy of census information. Had the Census Bureau consulted with the Institute for Community Research prior to the census issues concerning extra names on mailboxes, special problems with the street numbers in the area, and training enumerators on certain confusing issues in the neighborhood would have been shared and clarified. This, we believe, would have improved the accuracy of the information the census obtained.

Acknowledgement

Mr. Benjamin Wilson, a member of the research team in the Hartford site, passed away in August, 1992. Benjamin, better known as "Byrd", was one of the main contributors of this research. During the initial field work in May-June 1990, "Byrd" introduced us to the neighborhood. In December 1990, during the follow up period, he brought efficiency and warmth to the research process. I shall certainly miss him.

DISCLAIMER

Attached is the final report for one of the 29 independent Joint Statistical Agreement projects which conducted an ethnographic evaluation of the behavioral causes of undercount. All 29 studies followed common methodological guidelines.

This report is based in analysis of the results of a match between the author(s)' Alternative Enumeration to data from the 1990 Decennial Census forms for the same site. Each ethnographic site contained about 100 housing units. Information was compiled from census forms that were recovered through October 10, 1990.

The data on which this report is based should be considered preliminary for several reasons.

- Between October 10, 1990 and December 31, 1990 additional census forms may have been added to or deleted from the official enumeration of the site as a result of coverage improvement operations, local review or other late census operations. Differences between October 10, 1990 and final census results as reported on the Unedited Detail File will be incorporated in later analyses of data from this site.
- The consistency of the author's coding of data has not been fully verified.
- Hypothesis tests and other analyses are original to the author.

Therefore, the quantitative results contained in this final JSA report may differ from later reports issued by Census Bureau Staff referring to the same site.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from:

Bureau of the Census
Center for Survey Methods Research
Washington Plaza Building, Room 433
Washington, DC 20233-4700