



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, DC 20233-0001

March 2, 2010

ACSO Research and Evaluation Memorandum Series

No. ACS-R&E -10-03

MEMORANDUM FOR Distribution List

From: Susan Schechter **{signed 3/4/10}**
Chief, American Community Survey Office

Subject: Final Results – Evaluation of Group Quarters Operational Feasibility
and Quality (Data Collection)

Contact Person: Judy G. Belton
Chief, Group Quarters Branch
American Community Survey Office

Attached are the final results of an evaluation studying the operational feasibility and quality of the American Community Survey (ACS) Group Quarters (GQ) data collection operation. In January 2006, the ACS was expanded to include the population living in GQs, but until now no formal evaluation has been conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the program. This evaluation has the results of (1) response rates and reasons for noninterview; and (2) GQ item allocation in 2006, 2007, and 2008.

Attachment: Evaluation of Group Quarters Operational Feasibility and Quality (Data Collection)

Distribution List:

Daniel H. Weinberg (DIR)
ACS Division Chiefs Forum List
ACSO All Staff Meeting List

Evaluation of Group Quarters Operational Feasibility and Quality (Data Collection)

FINAL REPORT

U S C E N S U S B U R E A U

Helping You Make Informed Decisions

**JUDY BELTON
DENISE SMITH
TOMAS ENCARNACION
AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY OFFICE**

EVALUATION OF GROUP QUARTERS OPERATIONAL FEASIBILITY AND QUALITY (DATA COLLECTION)

Judy Belton
Denise Smith
Tomás Encarnación

March 2, 2010

INTRODUCTION

In January 2006, the American Community Survey (ACS) was expanded to include the population living in Group Quarters (GQ). GQs are places where people live or stay, in a group living arrangement that is owned or managed by an entity or organization providing housing and/or services for residents. This is not a typical household-type living arrangement. These services may include custodial or medical care as well as other types of assistance, and residency is commonly restricted to those receiving services. People living in GQs are usually not related to each other. Examples of GQs include such places as:

- College/University student housing
- Residential treatment centers for adults
- Nursing facilities/Skilled-nursing facilities
- Group homes intended for adults
- Military quarters
- Correctional facilities for adults
- Workers' group quarters and Job Corps centers

The GQ operation is conducted monthly and each monthly data collection period (or panel) runs six weeks.¹ GQs from all states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are selected each year to participate in the ACS. As shown in Table A below, approximately 18,000 GQs (both large and small)² were sampled in 2006, 2007, and 2008, and about 2,000 of the GQs were visited more than once over the data collection year (known as multiple hits).³ Multiple hits mean that a facility is visited more than once during the data collection period. Mostly large GQs may be visited multiple times throughout the data collection year.

Table A. Number of GQs in Sample: 2006, 2007, and 2008

Year	Total Number of Sampled GQs	Sampled Large GQs (expected population greater than 15)	Sampled Small GQs (expected population 15 or less)	Total Number of Hits
2006	18,101	15,436	2,665	20,280
2007	17,873	15,177	2,696	19,943
2008	17,761	14,956	2,805	19,975

Source: 2009 Group Quarters Initial Sampling Results for the American and Puerto Rico Community Survey.

¹ A February panel (or collection period) will run from February 1 to the second week of March, and the March panel will run from March 1 to the second week of April.

² A small GQ is one having 15 or fewer people according to Census 2000 or updated information, and a large GQ is one having more than 15 people according to Census 2000 or updated information

³ For more information on GQ sampling, please see the evaluation, The Quality of the Group Quarters Sampling Frame, Williams, Andre (2003)

As shown in Table B, the GQ sample is spread across 7 major GQ types.⁴ GQ facilities are divided into two categories, “Institutional” and Noninstitutional” GQ types. Institutional GQs include: adult correctional facilities, juvenile facilities, nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities, and other institutional facilities (including psychiatric hospitals/units, hospitals with patients who have no usual home elsewhere, and in-patient hospice facilities). Noninstitutional GQs include: college/university student housing, military quarters and other noninstitutional facilities (including emergency and transitional shelters, group homes intended for adults, residential treatment centers for adults, workers’ group living quarters and Job Corps centers, and religious GQs). As you can see in Table B, of the large GQ types, nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities, college/university student housing, and correctional facilities for adults make up most of the GQ sample. There are GQ types that were included in Census 2000 (and will be included in the 2010 Census) that are out of scope for the ACS such as domestic violence shelters, living quarters for victims of natural disasters, and soup kitchens.

Table B. Distribution of Sample by Major GQ Type

Major GQ Type Group	Number of Sampled Large GQs	Percent of Total Large GQs	Number of Sampled Small GQs	Percent of Total Small GQs
Correctional Facilities for Adults	3,442	23.0	113	4.0
Juvenile Facilities	241	1.6	86	3.0
Nursing Facilities/Skilled- Nursing Facilities	4,151	27.7	186	6.6
Other Institutional Facilities	320	2.1	128	4.5
College/University Student Housing	4,525	30.2	197	7.0
Military Quarters	658	4.4	96	3.4
Other Noninstitutional Facilities	1,645	11.0	2,016	71.4
Total	14,982	100.0	2,822	100.0

Source: 2009 Group Quarters Initial Sampling Results for the American and Puerto Rico Community Survey.

The ACS GQ data collection is conducted primarily through Field Representative (FR) personal visit interviews. There are two phases to the operation. In the first phase, FRs conduct a personal visit with the GQ contact person (such as the facility manager or college administrator) to collect data about the sampled GQ (or GQ level interviews) using a Group Quarters Facility Questionnaire (GQFQ). During the visit, FRs ask the GQ contact person a variety of questions, such as to verify the GQ type (i.e. nursing facility/skilled-nursing facility, college/university student housing, emergency and transitional shelters, etc.), location of the GQ, and the number of residents currently residing in the GQ. The number of residents in the GQ is needed to help the FR to draw a sample of residents to interview and complete the GQ questionnaire. Completion of the GQFQ takes, on average, about 15 minutes.

⁴ The GQs sampled are selected from a Universe file of GQs. These are the approximate number of large and small GQs sampled each year from each GQ type. These numbers do not represent the number of hits a GQ may have.

During phase two, FRs conduct interviews with sampled residents using the ACS GQ questionnaire. The number of residents selected is based on the number of residents currently residing in the GQ. In large GQs (greater than 15 residents), 10 residents are randomly selected. In small GQs (resident population is 15 or fewer), every resident is selected for interview. Close to 200,000 residents living in the sampled GQs are selected for a personal interview each year.⁵ The GQ questionnaire includes all of the demographic, social and economic questions that are on the ACS Housing Unit questionnaire. It does not include housing questions. FRs are instructed to conduct a face-to-face interview with sampled residents, but have other options available, such as self-response (FR leaves the form with the sample resident), proxy, collecting information from the GQ contact person, or a telephone interview if the sample resident requests to be contacted later by telephone. Information from administrative records provided by the facility contact person can also be used to complete the questionnaire. The resident-level interviews take about 25 minutes each to complete.

As Table C shows below, the majority of interviews were answered by the sample GQ resident in 2006, 2007, and 2008, although by 2008 an increasing number of interviews were answered by a proxy for the sample resident. A proxy can be a family member who completes the questionnaire on behalf of sampled resident. A facility contact person is also considered a proxy, but has to be sworn as a Special Sworn Status (SSS) individual prior to providing information. The use of proxies may depend on the GQ type. Section II of this evaluation will look at data quality (item allocation) based on who answered the GQ questionnaire.

Table C. Who Answered the GQ Questionnaire: 2006, 2007, and 2008

Who Answered the GQ Questionnaire	2006		2007		2008	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sample Person	61,761	42.3	57,764	40.3	89,992	63.7
Proxy for Sample Person	12,829	8.8	12,700	8.9	46,949	33.2
Both Sample Person and Proxy	32,902	22.5	37,531	26.2	3,658	2.6
Don't Know	38,653	26.4	35,252	24.6	653	0.5
*Total	146,145	100.0	143,247	100.0	141,252	100.0

Source: ACSO Data Capture File

*These numbers represent the number of 'completed' interviews. For example in 2008, 200,000 residents may have been randomly selected to participate in the ACS, but a completed interview was conducted for 141,252 residents. The remaining residents were refusals and other noninterview types

⁵ Although close to 200,000 residents are selected, some interviews result in Noninterviews such as refusals. See Section I of this evaluation, Group Quarters Population Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterview at the National Level for 2006, 2007, and 2008.

There are special procedures for data collection at some facilities. The Census Bureau works with liaisons from the Bureau of Prisons (BoP) who assist the Census Bureau in gaining access to federal facilities. FRs do not conduct face to face interviews with inmates at prisons; instead, GQ questionnaires are provided to facility contact persons who have been sworn in as a SSS. The contact person distributes the questionnaires to the sampled residents, picks them up, and sends the completed forms back to the Regional Offices (RO). The Census Bureau has also developed a partnership with the Department of Defense to collect data at military quarters (includes barracks and military ships). The data collection at military quarters is the same as regular GQ data collection, except that contact persons at these facilities receive notice from higher-level department heads to expect ACS field staff, and to cooperate to the fullest extent possible. Data collection at these GQ facilities has been successful because of these partnerships.

The purpose of the evaluation is to look at data collection years 2006, 2007, and 2008 to determine the operational feasibility and data quality of GQ collection. This evaluation is written in two sections. Each section includes research background information, methodology, results, and conclusions.

Section I evaluates the GQ population response rates and reasons for noninterviews, and will answer the research question, “To what extent was the GQ operation successful in obtaining GQ resident-level response or cooperation?”

Section II evaluates GQ item allocation rates and will answer the question, “What was the quality (based on allocation rates) of the GQ data collected?”

I. GROUP QUARTERS POPULATION RESPONSE RATES AND REASONS FOR NONINTERVIEWS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL FOR 2006, 2007, AND 2008

A. BACKGROUND

This section of the evaluation provides analysis of the GQ population response rates and the reasons for noninterviews in 2006, 2007, and 2008. Results are summarized overall and by the seven major GQ types (correctional facilities for adults, juvenile facilities, nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities, other institutional facilities, college/university student housing, military quarters, and other noninstitutional facilities) as well as by institutional and noninstitutional GQs. Measuring unit nonresponse is important because it has a direct effect on the quality of the data. Unit nonresponse is the failure to obtain the minimum required information from a GQ resident in the sample in order for the sampled unit to be counted as an interview. For GQs, this occurs, for example, when the sample resident refuses to participate, the GQ facility refuses to participate, the field representative is unable to locate the respondent, or when unique situations exist that prevent the FR from obtaining the interview. The eight reasons for noninterviews are listed below. Analyzing nonresponse by specific reasons helps the Census Bureau understand why unit nonresponse occurred.

- 1) **GQ Person Refusal** – The sampled GQ person refused to participate.
- 2) **Unable to Locate GQ Person** – The sampled GQ person could not be located.
- 3) **Resident Temporarily Absent** – The field representative (FR) confirmed that the sampled GQ person is away during the entire six-week interview period, for example, on vacation or spending time with relatives, etc.
- 4) **Language Problem** – The FR could not conduct an interview because of language barriers and was not able to get an interpreter who could translate.
- 5) **Insufficient Data** – To be considered an interviewed unit in the ACS, the GQ person's response had to have a minimum amount of data. Sampled cases **not** meeting this minimum are treated as noninterviews in the estimation process.
- 6) **GQ Person Other Reason** – Unique situations when the reason for noninterview does not fit into one of the other classifications.
- 7) **Whole GQ Refusal** – Some GQs refuse to allow the Census Bureau to conduct an ACS interview with any of their residents, citing legal or other reasons.
- 8) **Whole GQ Other Reason** – These account for other situations where no one in the GQ was interviewed due to reasons other than refusals.

B. METHODOLOGY

Tables in this section display unit response rates and reasons for noninterviews at the national level for each survey year (2006, 2007, and 2008). A survey year encompasses the sum of 12 monthly panels or 12 independent samples. There is a new GQ sample each month. The response rates do not include Puerto Rico. Weighted GQ population response rates are calculated as the ratio of the estimate of GQ persons interviewed after all personal visit attempts to the estimate of all GQ persons selected for interview. The response rates are weighted because not all sample cases in GQs have the same probabilities of selection. These weights account for the probabilities associated with sampling only. For interviews to be considered complete when calculating response rates, both completed interviews and those that were partially complete but have enough information to meet the requirements of a completed interview were included. Because the requirements for a complete interview is somewhat low, response rates may be high but can result in high item nonresponse rates and high allocation rates. The GQ population response rate and reasons for noninterview rates were calculated as follows:

$$\text{GQ Population Response Rate} = \frac{\text{Initially weighted estimate of GQ persons interviewed in year y}}{\text{Initially weighted estimate of GQ persons eligible to be interviewed for year y}} * 100$$

$$\text{Noninterview Rate for Reason A} = \frac{\text{Initially weighted estimate of GQ persons not interviewed for reason A in year y}}{\text{Initially weighted estimate of GQ persons eligible to be interviewed for year y}} * 100$$

The data shown in the tables in this section are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The sampling error of these response rates measure the degree of uncertainty associated with the estimates. Direct estimates of the standard errors were calculated for all estimates reported in this section and used to conduct statistical testing of direct comparisons of two point estimates to determine if year-to-year differences were significant.

C. RESULTS

1. Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews -- National

Overall, the GQ population response rates at the national level have been extremely high since the inclusion of GQs in the American Community Survey in 2006. Table 1 shows that the GQ population response rate in 2006, 2007, and 2008 were 97.4 percent, 97.8 percent and 98.0 percent, respectively. The GQ population response rates have increased since 2006. Table 1A in the appendix has the standard errors for the percents shown in Table 1.

Table 1. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews: 2006, 2007, and 2008

Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews	Year		
	2006	2007	2008
Response Rates	97.4	97.8	98.0
Reasons for Noninterviews:			
Group Quarters Person Refusal	0.8	0.4	0.5
Unable to Locate Group Quarters Person	0.2	0.2	0.1
Resident Temporarily Absent	0.1	0.1	0.1
Language Problem	0.0	0.0	0.0
Insufficient Data	0.1	0.0	0.1
Group Quarters Person Other Reason	0.6	1.2	1.0
Whole Group Quarters Refusal	0.5	0.3	0.2
Whole Group Quarters Other Reason	0.2	0.3	0.0
Residents Eligible for Interview (Weighted)	6,147,708	6,467,188	6,664,552

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006, 2007, and 2008 American Community Survey

Note: Percents shown as “0.0” percent are rounded and < 0.05 percent.

The three main reasons for GQ person noninterviews were: 1) GQ person other reason, 2) GQ person refusal, and 3) whole GQ refusal. For all three survey years these were the three main reasons for noninterviews. However in 2007, the noninterview reason of “whole GQ other reason,” which includes other situations where no one in the GQ was interviewed due to reasons other than refusals was also one of the main noninterview reasons. High unit nonresponse increases the chance of bias in the final survey estimates. The GQ unit nonresponse rates for each of the reasons for noninterviews are relatively low for each survey year. Noninterviews at GQs in 2006, 2007, and 2008 seldom occurred because of a language barrier.

2. Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews by Institutional and Noninstitutional Group Quarters

Since 2006, the response rate has been higher in institutional GQs than in noninstitutional GQs. However, the response rate in noninstitutional GQs has continually improved each year. Table 2 shows that in both 2007 and 2008 the GQ population response rate in institutional GQs was 98.3 percent and in 2006, 98.6 percent whereas in noninstitutional GQs, the GQ population response rates were 95.7 percent, 96.9 percent, and 97.5 percent, in 2006, 2007 and 2008, respectively. For each survey year in institutional GQs, two major reasons for noninterviews include: 1) unique situations that do not fit any other classification (GQ person other reason) (0.4 percent in 2006, 1.4 percent in 2007, and 1.3 percent in 2008) and 2) GQ person refusing to participate in the ACS (GQ person refusal) for each survey year (0.7 percent in 2006, 0.1 percent in 2007, and 0.2 percent in 2008). Possible reasons for an increase in the noninterview rates for “GQ person other reason” may be the result of more health care facilities like in-patient hospice facilities and nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities experiencing an increase in “deaths among the sampled residents,” as well as an increase in cases where a “facility is quarantined.”

The noninterview rate due to GQ person refusal in the ACS in noninstitutional GQs showed no statistically significant differences over time with rates of 1.0 percent in 2006, and 0.9 percent in 2007 and 2008. The noninterview rates due to GQ person other reason were 0.9 percent in 2006, 0.8 percent in 2007 and 0.5 percent in 2008. However, the noninterview reason due to the whole GQ refusal was also a major reason for GQ person noninterviews in noninstitutional GQs in 2006, 2007 and 2008 (0.9 percent, and 0.5 percent for both 2007 and 2008, respectively). Table 2A in the appendix has the standard errors for the percents shown in Table 2.

Table 2. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Institutional and Noninstitutional Group Quarters: 2006, 2007, and 2008

Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews	Institutional GQs			Noninstitutional GQs		
	Year			Year		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
Response Rate	98.6	98.3	98.3	95.7	96.9	97.5
Reasons for Noninterviews:						
Group Quarters Person Refusal	0.7	0.1	0.2	1.0	0.9	0.9
Unable to Locate Group Quarters Person	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.5	0.3
Resident Temporarily Absent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3
Language Problem	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Insufficient Data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.1
Group Quarters Person Other Reason	0.4	1.4	1.3	0.9	0.8	0.5
Whole Group Quarters Refusal	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.9	0.5	0.5
Whole Group Quarters Other Reason	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
Residents Eligible for Interview (Weighted)	3,703,091	4,024,183	4,021,932	2,444,616	2,443,006	2,642,621

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006, 2007, and 2008 American Community Survey

Note: Percents shown as "0.0" percent are rounded and < 0.05 percent.

3. Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews by Seven Major Group Quarters Types

Table 3 shows the GQ population response rates with reasons for noninterviews by major institutional GQ types for 2006, 2007, and 2008. Table 4 shows these data by major noninstitutional GQ Types for the same survey years. The response rates for each of the seven major GQ types were above 90 percent for each GQ type for every survey year (2006, 2007 and 2008). When comparing the response rates for institutional GQ types in 2008, the rates for both juvenile facilities and nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities (99.7 percent) were statistically significantly higher than the rate for correctional facilities (97.2 percent). The response rate for other institutional facilities was not statistically significantly different from the rates of the other selected institutional GQ types. The response rates at nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities were 99 percent or higher for each survey year. In the earlier years of the GQ survey (2006, 2007), the response rates for juvenile facilities were 98.2 percent and 99.2 percent, respectively. These rates were statistically significantly different. Table 3A in the appendix has the standard errors for the percents shown in Table 3.

Table 3. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Major Institutional Group Quarters Types: 2006, 2007, and 2008

Response Rates and Reason for Noninterviews	Correctional Facilities for Adults			Juvenile Facilities			Nursing Facilities/Skilled Nursing Facilities			Other Institutional Facilities		
	Year			Year			Year			Year		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
Response Rates	97.9	97.4	97.2	98.2	99.2	99.7	99.5	99.6	99.7	97.6	97.8	96.8
Reasons for Noninterviews:												
Group Quarters Person Refusal	1.2	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.7
Unable to Locate Group Quarters Person	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Resident Temporarily Absent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Language Problem	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Insufficient Data	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Group Quarters Person Other Reason	0.4	2.4	2.2	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	2.5
Whole Group Quarters Refusal	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.4	0.0
Whole Group Quarters Other Reason	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Residents Eligible for Interview (Weighted)	1,978,308	2,184,021	2,183,762	155,476	147,381	173,685	1,502,094	1,605,963	1,601,358	67,213	86,818	63,127

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006, 2007, and 2008 American Community Survey

Note: Percents shown as "0.0" percent are rounded and < 0.05 percent.

Table 4 shows the GQ population response rates with reasons for noninterviews in noninstitutional GQ types. For each survey year, the three noninstitutional GQ types (college/university student housing, military quarters, and other noninstitutional facilities) had high response rates. The response rates for each of these types were about 96 percent in 2006 and about 97 percent in 2008. The response rates in 2008 for the noninstitutional GQ types were not statistically significantly different from each other. In 2008, the response rates for the selected noninstitutional GQ types were: college/university student housing (97.6 percent), military quarters (96.7 percent) and other noninstitutional GQs (97.5 percent). Table 4A in the appendix has the standard errors for the percents shown in Table 4.

Table 4. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Major Noninstitutional GQ Types: 2006, 2007, and 2008

Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews	College/University Student Housing			Military Quarters			Other Noninstitutional Facilities		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
Response Rates	95.7	97.2	97.6	95.5	95.2	96.7	95.8	96.9	97.5
Reasons for Noninterviews:									
Group Quarters Person Refusal	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.1	1.2	0.9	0.8	0.4	0.5
Unable to Locate Group Quarters Person Resident Temporarily Absent	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.0
Language Problem	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.6	2.0	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.1
Insufficient Data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Group Quarters Person Other Reason	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1
Whole Group Quarters Refusal	1.1	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.7	1.0	0.7
Whole Group Quarters Other Reason	0.2	0.1	0.2	1.4	0.5	0.1	2.1	1.4	1.0
	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1
Residents Eligible for Interview (Weighted)	1,488,640	1,455,388	1,505,615	230,073	228,576	288,914	725,904	759,042	848,091

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006, 2007, and 2008 American Community Survey

Note: Percents shown as "0.0" percent are rounded and < 0.05 percent.

The high response rates may be attributed to many things. Probably the main reason is that the GQ data collection operation permits multiple methods for obtaining a completed GQ questionnaire. Another reason for high response rates is that a case is recognized as an interview if enough information is collected to classify the interview as a completed interview. The data processing criteria for a completed interview require a minimum of three responses.

In 2006, one of the main reasons for noninterviews in juvenile facilities was due to "GQ person other reason." In 2006, the rate for this reason (1.0 percent) when compared to the rates for the other reasons for noninterviews, were statistically significant. However, in 2007 the rate for this reason (0.4 percent) and the rate for the reason "whole GQ refusal" (0.3 percent) were not statistically significant. In 2008, the rate for this noninterview

reason (0.3 percent) and the rates for the other noninterview reasons were not statistically significant. The reason “GQ person other reason” was also the main reason for noninterviews in correctional facilities for adults in 2007 and 2008. However, in 2006, “GQ person refusal” was the main reason for GQ noninterviews in correctional facilities for adults. This may have been the result of the survey being new and people not being very knowledgeable about the ACS GQ data collection operation. In 2008, the noninterview rate for correctional facilities for the noninterview reasons “GQ person other reason” (2.2 percent) and “GQ person refusal” (0.4 percent) was statistically significantly higher than the response rate for these reasons for both juvenile facilities and nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities.

For correctional facilities for adults, more research is needed to identify possible reasons for the 1.8 percentage point increase from 2006 to 2008 for the reason “GQ person other reason.” Decreases in noninterview rates for the reason “GQ person refusal” may be the result of the sampled GQ facilities being more knowledgeable about the ACS GQ data collection operation as well as the inmates. Also, the decrease in noninterviews rates may be attributed to an increase in the use of administrative records as the method of data collection at these types of facilities.

For other institutional facilities, which includes mental (psychiatric) hospitals and psychiatric units in other hospitals, and in-patient hospice facilities, noninterview rates for the reason “GQ person refusal,” were 0.1 percent in 2006 and 0.7 percent in 2008 and for “GQ person other reason” the noninterview rates were 0.1 percent in 2006 and 2.5 percent in 2008. The rates for both of these reasons were not statistically significant.

For noninstitutional GQ types like college/university student housing, the main reason for noninterviews was due to “GQ person refusal.” However, the noninterview rate for the reason “GQ person other reason” has declined significantly since 2006 from 1.1 percent to 0.4 percent. This noninterview rate may have improved because of increased knowledge of the ACS GQ operation by FRs and GQ contact persons including administrators. For military quarters, the main reason for a noninterview was because of “whole GQ refusal” in 2006. The noninterview rate for this reason in 2008 was 0.1 percent, which is a statistically significant improvement since 2006. The possible reason for the decline in the rate for this reason may be the same one noted for college/university student housing.

In 2008, when comparing the college/university student housing noninterview rates to the noninterview rates for military quarters by reason for noninterviews, none of the noninterview rates were statistically significant. The noninterview rates for college/university student housing and other noninstitutional GQs, were significant for five of the eight noninterview reasons. The rates were not significant for “whole GQ other reason,” “insufficient data,” and “language problem.”

When comparing the noninterviews rates for military quarters to the rates for other noninstitutional facilities, the rates for the reasons “GQ person other reason” and “whole GQ refusal” were the only noninterview reasons that were statistically significant. For military quarters, the noninterview rates for “whole GQ refusal” decreased from 1.4

percent to 0.1 percent and the rates for other noninstitutional facilities decreased from 2.1 percent in 2006 to 1.0 percent in 2008. Again, the possible reason for the decrease in noninterview rates may be because of increased knowledge of the ACS GQ operation by FRs and GQ contact persons and administrators. However, the noninterview rates in 2006 and 2008 were not statistically significant for military quarters or other noninstitutional facilities for the reason “GQ person other reason.”

D. CONCLUSION

Overall, the ACS GQ data collection operation at the national level for all three survey years (2006, 2007 and 2008) has been successful at obtaining GQ resident-level interviews, which is apparent from the high GQ population response rates for each survey year. Improvements in GQ population response rates may be attributed to many things; such as 1) increased knowledge of the ACS GQ operation by FRs and GQ contact persons including administrators; 2) the availability of a variety of GQ data collection methods for the FR to use to complete the ACS GQ questionnaire, and 3) determining a minimum amount of information being needed to classify the interview as a completed interview. Since 2006, the response rates in institutional GQs have been higher than at noninstitutional GQs. In general, for all the noninstitutional GQ types, more research is needed to assess why these GQs are reluctant to participate in the ACS.

II. ITEM ALLOCATION RATES FROM THE GROUP QUARTERS POPULATION

A. BACKGROUND

The quality of the data from the ACS GQ program is directly impacted by our ability to collect complete responses for each item on the GQ questionnaire. However, due to the multiple constraints posed by the nature of GQ facilities, such as privacy and security concerns, sometimes it is difficult, if not impossible, to collect this information. Every time a FR visits a GQ for the purpose of collecting data from sample residents, the FR must decide which method of data collection to use depending on the GQ type and the constraints posed by the GQ facility in sample. The preferred method of data collection is a personal interview (face-to-face interview) with the sample resident.

During post-data collection processing, questionnaires are edited and allocation procedures are used to deal with inconsistent and missing responses. The focus of this section is to analyze the item allocation rates for the GQ population. The overuse of item allocation directly affects the quality of the data collected to such an extent that data might in some instances, need to be suppressed or not published at all for geographic areas with high item allocation rates.

For this analysis, allocation rates were calculated at the national level for the 2006 and 2008 ACS GQ data and were analyzed for both institutional and noninstitutional GQ facilities in the United States. Item allocation rates for Puerto Rico are not included in this analysis.

B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This section's aim is to answer the following five research questions:

1. Have item allocation rates increased over time?
2. What are the item allocation rates by the seven major GQ types?
3. Is there a difference in item allocation rates based on who provided answers to the questions (sample person, proxy respondent, or both)?
4. Is there a difference in item allocation rates based on the methodology used to collect the data (self-response, face-to-face, or telephone)?
5. Is there a difference in item allocation rates based on the use of administrative records to collect GQ survey person level data?

C. METHODOLOGY

This section of the evaluation makes use of item allocation rates as the methodology framework. Allocation is a method of imputation used when values for missing or inconsistent items cannot be derived from the existing response record. The rate is the

percentage of times this method is used.⁶ For this study, allocation rates were calculated as follows:

Allocation rate for item A (year y) =

$$\frac{\text{Total number of responses allocated for item A for year y}}{\text{Total number of responses to item A required for year y}} * 100$$

The data used for the analysis were drawn from the national GQ universe files that were eligible for editing and imputation for the 2006 and 2008 GQ data collection periods including the population living in both institutional and noninstitutional GQs facilities. The study makes use of final weights, which include adjustments for unit nonresponse and control to GQ population estimates, to analyze item allocation rates for the twelve selected variables among all seven major GQs types, as applicable. These items were selected because we noticed high item allocation rates during a preliminary investigation. Table 5 is a list of the specific items and associated universes included in this analysis.

Table 5. Items Analyzed

Item Category	Universe	Item Category	Universe
Race	Total population	Educational attainment	Population 3 years and over
Hispanic origin	Total population	Marital status	Population 15 years and over
Sex	Total population	Veteran status	Population 17 years and over
Age	Total population	Employment status recode ⁷	Noninstitutionalized population 16 years and over
Date of Birth	Total population	When last worked	Noninstitutionalized population 16 years and over
Citizenship	Total population	Food stamp reciprocity	Total population

Operational information collected during the person level interviews in 2008 was used to determine who the respondent was and the method used to collect the data. Specifically, FRs were asked to complete the questions shown in Figure 1 for 2008. Responses to question 1 define “Who answered.” Responses to question 2 were used to determine the method of data collection. “Administrative Records Use” was based on responses to question 3.

⁶ In these cases, the imputation must be based on techniques such as using answers from other people in the household, other responding housing units, or people believed to have similar characteristics. Such donors are reflected in a table referred to as an allocation matrix. The rate is the percentage of times this method is used. “A *Compass for Understanding American Community Survey Data: What General Data Users Need to Know*, October 2008.” Retrieved March 2, 2010 (<http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/ACSGeneralHandbook.pdf>).

⁷ The Employment Status Recode captures the six different possible states of employment, which are: employed and at work; employed, with a job but not at work; unemployed; in the armed forces and at work; in the armed forces, with a job but not at work; and not in the labor force. This variable is only defined for people 16 years old and older. Excluded from the employed are people whose only activity consisted of work around the house or unpaid volunteer work for religious, charitable, and similar organizations; also excluded are all institutionalized people and people on active duty in the United States Armed Forces. “*American Community Survey – Puerto Rico Community Survey. 2008 Subject Definition.*” Retrieved March 2, 2010 (<http://www.census.gov/acs/www/UseData/Def.htm>).

Figure 1. ACS-1(GQ) 2008 Questionnaire Instrument – Census Use Only Page

CENSUS USE ONLY

1. Who answered the questions on this form? *Mark (X) one box.*

Sample person

Proxy for the sampled person

Both

Don't know

2. How were the questions on this form completed? *Mark (X) one box.*

By personal interview

By telephone interview

By self-response

By combination of methods

Don't know

3. Were administrative records used to complete any of the questions on this form?
Mark (X) one box.

No

Some administrative record information was used

All responses were obtained from administrative record information

Don't know

The seven major group quarter types and group quarter institutional/noninstitutional variables were then cross tabulated nationally by the responses to these 3 questions. The margins of errors for all of the combinations were calculated using the same methods as in ACS production.

D. RESULTS

The universe counts and margins of error for the percentages for each table presented in this section (Tables 6 through 16) are shown in Appendix B, as Tables 6A-16A.

Have item allocation rates increased over time?

To answer this question we compared allocation rates in 2008 to those in 2006. Table 6 shows the allocation rates for selected characteristics on the ACS GQ questionnaire for 2006 and 2008.

When comparing 2006 and 2008 allocation rates for the selected characteristics, we found that for two of the selected items (age and date of birth) allocation rates decreased in 2008 compared with 2006. The allocation rates for all the remaining items, with the exception of sex, increased. The demographic characteristic items such as race and Hispanic origin had a small increase of approximately one percentage point. Three items with high allocation increases include marital status, when last worked, and employment status recode. Marital status and when last worked, both had an allocation rate increase of approximately 5 percentage points and employment status recode had an allocation rate increase of 10 percentage points in 2008.

Table 6. Allocation Rates for Selected Items for the ACS GQs
Population: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006	2008	2008-2006	
	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif 2008-2006	Margin of Error Dif
Race	2.0	2.9	0.9*	0.20
Hispanic origin	2.5	3.7	1.1*	0.22
Sex	0.2	0.2	0.0*	0.04
Age	2.2	0.7	-1.5*	0.14
Date of birth	7.3	3.8	-3.5*	0.22
Citizenship	5.7	6.3	0.6*	0.32
Educational attainment	12.9	14.6	1.8*	0.32
Marital status	2.8	7.6	4.8*	0.32
Veteran status	10.1	11.3	1.2*	0.32
Employment status recode	7.2	17.4	10.2*	0.63
When last worked	12.1	16.7	4.7*	0.41
Person food stamp reciprocity	11.7	12.6	0.9*	0.32

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 7 shows the item allocation rates for selected characteristics in institutional and noninstitutional GQs. In institutional GQs, there was a fluctuation of 0.5 percentage points in the allocation rates for Hispanic origin. The allocation rates for age and date of birth characteristics decreased by 1.8 percent and 5.3 percent between 2006 and 2008. Three of the items in the social characteristics show an allocation rate increase of approximately 2 to 3 percent (educational attainment, marital status, and when last worked). No differences are found for the rest of the social characteristic items (citizenship, veteran status, and person food stamp reciprocity).

In noninstitutional GQs, the allocation rates for race and Hispanic origin increased by approximately 2 percent, while the allocation rate for age and date of birth decreased by approximately the same amount. The allocation rates for all the social characteristics increased during the same period between 2 percent and 10 percent. Citizenship had the lowest allocation rate increase of approximately 2 percent, compared to employment status recode, which had the highest increase, 10 percent.

Table 7. Allocation Rates for Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population: 2006 and 2008 by Institutional/Noninstitutional

Items	Institutional				Noninstitutional			
	2006	2008	2008-2006	Margin of Error Dif	2006	2008	2008-2006	Margin of Error Dif
	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif		% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	
Race	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.14	2.9	4.6	1.7*	0.32
Hispanic origin	2.1	2.5	0.4*	0.22	3.0	4.9	2.0*	0.32
Sex	0.2	0.3	0.1*	0.00	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.10
Age	2.4	0.7	-1.8*	0.14	1.9	0.7	-1.2*	0.14
Date of birth	7.9	2.7	-5.3*	0.36	6.7	5.0	-1.7*	0.45
Citizenship	5.5	5.2	-0.3	0.41	5.9	7.4	1.6*	0.51
Educational attainment	17.0	18.6	1.6*	0.54	8.5	10.5	2.0*	0.61
Marital status	3.6	7.0	3.4*	0.41	2.0	8.1	6.2*	0.51
Veteran status	12.0	11.9	-0.1	0.41	8.2	10.7	2.5*	0.63
Employment status recode	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.2	17.4	10.2*	0.63
When last worked	13.7	15.9	2.2*	0.45	10.4	17.5	7.1*	0.73
Person food stamp reciprocity	12.7	12.3	-0.4	0.51	10.6	12.9	2.4*	0.63

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

What are the item allocation rates by GQ type?

To answer this question, we first examined changes in the allocation rates between 2006 and 2008 by GQ type in both institutional and noninstitutional GQs. Comparisons were also made between GQ types to understand if data are more or less complete by type of GQ.

Institutional

Table 8 shows item allocation rates by GQ types within institutional GQs. For the demographic characteristics in adult correctional facilities, the allocation rates for race, Hispanic origin, and sex remained almost the same between 2006 and 2008. Only Hispanic origin had a small statistically significant increase of 0.5 percent. Item allocation rates for age decreased by 1 percent, while for date of birth it decreased by 4 percent. The allocation rate for the social characteristics, except for the citizenship item, increased between 1 and 3 percent. The veteran status item had the lowest increase of 1 percent, followed by educational attainment with 2 percent. Both marital status and when last worked had the highest increase of 3 percent.

In juvenile facilities, item allocation rates for the race, Hispanic origin, and sex items, remained about the same between 2006 and 2008. In contrast, item allocation rates for most of the social characteristics, except for the citizenship item, increased during the same period. Marital status had the largest increase of approximately 7 percent.

In nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities, there was a drop in the item allocation rate for date of birth -- from 10 percent in 2006 to 3 percent in 2008. There was a small fluctuation in item allocation for most of the social characteristic items between 2006 and 2008 of plus or minus 1 percent. Educational attainment had an increase in the allocation rate of approximately 2 percent, while marital status had a higher increase in allocation rate of 4 percent.

In other institutional facilities, for the social characteristics, only person food stamp reciprocity had a decline – 6.1 percent. Both marital status with 4.1 percent and when last worked with 8.6 percent had an increase, but were not significantly different from each other.

Table 8. Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional Group Quarters Type: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006 2008		2008-2006	
	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Adult correctional facilities				
Race	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.22
Hispanic origin	2.2	2.7	0.5*	0.22
Sex	0.2	0.3	0.1*	0.06
Age	1.6	0.3	-1.3*	0.14
Date of birth	5.6	1.6	-4.1*	0.28
Citizenship	3.5	3.7	0.2	0.41
Educational attainment	11.2	13.1	1.9*	0.63
Marital status	5.4	8.0	2.6*	0.41
Veteran status	9.0	10.3	1.3*	0.54
When last worked	16.1	19.1	3.0*	0.63
Person food stamp reciprocity	12.3	11.6	-0.7*	0.54
Juvenile facilities				
Race	2.8	2.2	-0.5	1.04
Hispanic origin	2.3	2.9	0.6	0.95
Sex	0.2	0.5	0.3*	0.22
Age	2.8	3.7	0.9	1.08
Date of birth	13.5	12.1	-1.4	2.51
Citizenship	7.2	4.8	-2.4*	2.06
Educational attainment	13.0	14.3	1.3	2.92
Marital status	0.4	7.0	6.6*	3.01
Veteran status	6.3	10.4	4.1	4.12
When last worked	13.6	17.1	3.6*	3.52
Person food stamp reciprocity	14.4	14.2	-0.2	3.32

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 8. (Cont.) Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional Group Quarters Type: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006	2008	2008-2006	
	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities				
Race	0.8	0.9	0.2	0.22
Hispanic origin	1.8	2.1	0.3	0.32
Sex	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.06
Age	3.3	0.6	-2.6*	0.14
Date of birth	10.0	3.0	-7.0*	0.54
Citizenship	7.1	6.6	-0.5	0.63
Educational attainment	23.6	25.4	1.9*	0.89
Marital status	1.7	5.8	4.1*	0.51
Veteran status	15.0	13.6	-1.5*	0.73
When last worked	10.6	11.6	1.0*	0.63
Person food stamp reciprocity	12.4	12.7	0.3	0.73
Other institutional facilities				
Race	1.2	1.3	0.1	1.03
Hispanic origin	4.4	4.5	0.2	3.35
Sex	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.28
Age	3.0	4.9	1.9	2.28
Date of birth	10.1	9.3	-0.8	3.57
Citizenship	11.8	10.1	-1.7	3.72
Educational attainment	21.2	17.4	-3.8	4.31
Marital status	4.2	8.3	4.1*	2.25
Veteran status	19.4	15.0	-4.5	5.19
When last worked	20.8	29.4	8.6*	4.61
Person food stamp reciprocity	23.4	17.3	-6.1*	5.03

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Noninstitutional

Table 9 shows item allocation rates by GQ type in noninstitutional GQs. In college/university student housing facilities, there were significant differences between 2006 and 2008 in allocation rates for every item, with the exception of sex and date of birth. Only age showed a decrease. Allocation rates for the race and Hispanic origin items increased by approximately 3 percent. For the social characteristics, large differences were found in the allocation rates for marital status (7.6 percent), veteran status (4.0 percent), employment status recode (12.6 percent), and when last worked (9.6 percent).

In military quarters there were no major changes in the allocation rates for most of the demographic and social characteristics, except for race, marital status, employment status recode, and when last worked. The increased allocation rates for race, employment status recode, marital status and when last worked were not significantly different from each other.

Similarly, in other noninstitutional facilities, there were no major changes in the allocation rates for most of the demographic characteristics in 2008 compared with 2006, except for date of birth which had an item allocation decrease of approximately 6 percentage points in 2008. The allocation rate for the social characteristics items increased between 2 and 8 percent in 2008. For marital status, the allocation rate increased by about 4 percent. Employment status recode had an allocation rate increase of approximately 8 percent. The allocation rates for when last worked increased by about 4 percent during the same period.

Table 9. Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Noninstitutional Group Quarters Types: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006	2008	2008-2006	
	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
College/university housing facilities				
Race	3.6	6.4	2.7*	0.51
Hispanic origin	3.5	6.6	3.1*	0.51
Sex	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.10
Age	1.7	0.6	-1.1*	0.22
Date of birth	4.4	4.7	0.3	0.45
Citizenship	6.1	8.8	2.8*	0.61
Educational attainment	4.4	6.8	2.4*	0.63
Marital status	2.2	9.7	7.6*	0.61
Veteran status	8.3	12.3	4.0*	0.82
Employment status recode	9.9	22.5	12.6*	0.92
When last worked	11.8	21.3	9.6*	0.92
Person food stamp reciprocity	9.8	14.7	5.0*	0.82

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 9. (Cont) Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Noninstitutional Group Quarters Types: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006	2008	2008-2006	Margin of Error Dif
	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	
Military quarters facilities				
Race	1.8	4.2	2.4*	1.36
Hispanic origin	2.2	2.4	0.2	0.95
Sex	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.10
Age	0.7	0.2	-0.4*	0.22
Date of birth	4.1	3.7	-0.4	1.62
Citizenship	4.3	4.4	0.2	1.08
Educational attainment	6.5	6.8	0.3	1.30
Marital status	0.9	3.6	2.7*	1.32
Veteran status	2.6	2.2	-0.5	0.76
Employment status recode	0.5	2.7	2.2*	0.73
When last worked	2.9	5.7	2.7*	1.02
Person food stamp reciprocity	7.1	7.3	0.2	1.43
Other noninstitutional facilities				
Race	1.9	1.5	-0.4	0.45
Hispanic origin	2.3	2.5	0.2	0.54
Sex	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.14
Age	2.5	0.9	-1.6*	0.22
Date of birth	11.5	5.9	-5.6*	0.98
Citizenship	5.9	5.7	-0.2	0.92
Educational attainment	16.2	18.3	2.1*	1.43
Marital status	2.1	6.5	4.4*	0.82
Veteran status	9.6	10.1	0.5	1.24
Employment status recode	4.4	12.1	7.7*	1.24
When last worked	10.1	13.6	3.6*	1.33
Person food stamp reciprocity	13.0	11.2	-1.8*	1.24

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 10. Comparison of Item Allocation Rates by Seven Major GQ Types: 2008

2008 Allocation Rates									
Items	Institutional GQs					Noninstitutional GQs			
	Total	Adult correctional facilities	Juvenile facilities	Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities	Other institutional facilities	Total	College/student university housing	Military quarters	Other noninstitutional facilities
Race	1.3	1.6	2.2	0.9	1.3	4.6	6.4	4.2	1.5
Hispanic origin	2.5	2.7	2.9	2.1	4.5	4.9	6.6	2.4	2.5
Sex	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3
Age	0.7	0.3	3.7	0.6	4.9	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.9
Date of birth	2.7	1.6	12.1	3.0	9.3	5.0	4.7	3.7	5.9
Citizenship	5.2	3.7	4.8	6.6	10.1	7.4	8.8	4.4	5.7
Educational attainment	18.6	13.1	14.3	25.4	17.4	1.5	6.8	6.8	18.3
Marital status	7.0	8.0	7.0	5.8	8.3	8.1	9.7	3.6	6.5
Veteran status	11.9	10.3	10.4	13.6	15.0	10.7	12.3	2.2	10.1
When last worked	15.9	19.1	17.1	11.6	29.4	17.5	21.3	5.7	13.6
Person food stamp reciprocity	12.3	11.6	14.2	12.7	17.3	12.9	14.7	7.3	11.2

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

This table's universe counts and margins of error for the percentages are shown in Appendix B, Tables 8a-9a.

So far, we have examined item allocation rates for selected characteristics for the institutionalized and noninstitutionalized GQ populations tabulated from the 2006 and 2008 ACS data. Table 10 shows a comparison of item allocation rates across major GQ types for 2008.

In general, the allocation rates for the demographic characteristics (age, sex, date of birth, race and Hispanic origin) are lower than the rates for the social characteristics for most GQ types. In 2008, like previous survey years, the sex item was very well reported. The allocation rate for this item was as low as 0.1 percent in college/university student housing and military quarters and as high as 0.5 percent in juvenile facilities.

The allocation rate for race in college/university student housing was only significantly higher than adult correctional facilities and nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities.

The allocation rate for Hispanic origin in college/university student housing was significantly higher than all but one GQ type, other noninstitutional facilities.

The allocation rates for the social characteristics were high for most of the GQ types. Examples of two social characteristics with high allocation rates were when last worked and educational attainment.

The allocation rates for when last worked were relatively high among all major GQ types, except for military quarters. The allocation rate for this item was as high as 29.4 percent in other institutional facilities and as low as 5.7 percent in military quarters. In other institutional facilities, the allocation rates for this item was higher than the rates for the other major GQ types. Other institutional facilities had the highest allocation rate followed by college/university student housing.

In adult correctional facilities, the allocation rate for when last worked was not statistically significant when compared to juvenile facilities and other noninstitutional facilities. Also, the allocation rates for this item for other noninstitutional facilities (13.6 percent) when compared to juvenile facilities (17.1 percent) was not statistically significant.

For the institutional GQ types, the allocation rates for educational attainment were higher than the rates for most noninstitutional GQ types. The allocation rates for this item ranged from 13.1 percent for adult correctional facilities to 25.4 percent for nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities. For the noninstitutional GQ types, the allocation rates for this item ranged from 6.8 percent for college/university student housing and military quarters to 18.3 percent for other noninstitutional facilities.

Is there a difference in item allocation rates based on who provided answers to the questions (sample person, proxy respondent, or both)?

Tables 11 and 12 show item allocation rates for selected items by who answered the questions; that is, did the sample resident, a proxy, or both the sample resident and a proxy complete the questionnaire. The tables include item allocation rates by institutional (Table 11) and noninstitutional (Table 12) GQ, and by the seven major group quarter's types for 2008.

Institutional

As shown in Table 11, allocation rates in institutional GQ were higher when the questionnaire was completed by a proxy, and lower when the sample resident completed the questionnaire. When a proxy completed the questionnaire, educational attainment, when last worked, veteran status, and food stamp reciprocity had increases of more than 20 percentage points. For questionnaires completed by both the sample resident and proxy, the differences were much less dramatic. For example, educational attainment and food stamp items allocation rates of 11.5 percent and 9.0 percent, respectively were not statistically significantly different from each other. When the sample resident completed the questionnaire, the allocation rates ranged from as low as 0.2 percent for age to as high as 4.2 percent for the when last worked item.

In adult correctional facilities, the allocation rates were much higher when a proxy completed the questionnaire, followed by when both the sample resident and a proxy completed the questionnaire. The when last worked item had the highest allocation rate. This allocation rate was 68.4 percent when the questionnaire was completed by the sample resident and 42.9 percent when both the sample resident and proxy completed it. The allocation rates for the educational attainment and food stamp items were also high. When a proxy completed the questionnaire, the allocation rate was 55.8 percent for educational attainment and 48.1 percent for the food stamp item. When both the sample resident and proxy completed the questionnaire, the allocation rates for these items were 27.9 percent and 28.9 percent, respectively, which were not significantly different from each other.

In juvenile facilities, the allocation rates for the selected characteristics were not different from each other regardless of who completed the questionnaire.

For nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities the allocation rates were highest for the educational attainment item (37.0 percent) when a proxy completed the questionnaire, and 10.2 percent, when both the sample resident and a proxy completed the questionnaire. For veteran status, when last worked and person food stamp reciprocity, the allocation rates were highest when a proxy completed the questionnaire compared to when the sample resident or both the sample resident and a proxy completed the questionnaire.

In other institutional facilities, the allocation rates were higher for three of the social characteristic items (citizenship, educational attainment, and when last worked) when a proxy completed the questionnaire compared to when a sample resident or both a sample resident and a proxy completed the questionnaire.

Table 11. Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional GQ Types by Who Answered the Questions on the Questionnaire: 2008

Items	Who Answered						
	Sample			Person-Proxy		Person-Both	
	Person Alloc	Proxy Alloc	Both Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Institutional							
Race	1.0	1.5	1.1	-0.5*	0.36	-0.1	0.63
Hispanic origin	1.4	3.6	1.1	-2.3*	0.41	0.2	0.51
Sex	0.2	0.3	0.3	-0.1	0.06	-0.1	0.20
Age	0.4	0.9	0.6	-0.5*	0.22	-0.1	0.32
Date of birth	1.5	4.4	2.8	-2.9*	0.71	-1.3*	1.20
Citizenship	0.9	10.9	2.5	-10.0*	0.91	-1.5*	0.81
Educational attainment	3.8	40.9	11.5	-37.1*	1.08	-7.8*	1.65
Marital status	1.4	14.6	4.7	-13.2*	0.82	-3.3*	1.51
Veteran status	2.4	24.9	7.3	-22.6*	0.95	-5.0*	1.73
When last worked	4.2	30.2	8.4	-26.0*	0.95	-4.2*	1.63
Person food stamp reciency	3.0	25.2	9.0	-22.3*	0.95	-6.1*	2.02
Adult correctional facilities							
Race	1.1	2.0	3.7	-0.9*	0.45	-2.5	3.21
Hispanic origin	1.5	5.9	3.9	-4.3*	0.63	-2.4	3.81
Sex	0.2	0.5	0.4	-0.3*	0.10	-0.2	0.70
Age	0.2	0.4	0.0	-0.2	0.22	0.2*	0.10
Date of birth	1.0	3.1	3.0	-2.0*	0.61	-2.0	2.10
Citizenship	0.7	14.4	11.7	-13.7*	1.70	-11.0*	4.20
Educational attainment	2.4	55.8	27.9	-53.5*	2.01	-25.5*	9.10
Marital status	1.2	33.7	21.9	-32.5*	1.51	-20.8*	6.80
Veteran status	2.1	39.3	37.0	-37.2*	2.02	-34.9*	8.51
When last worked	4.2	68.4	42.9	64.2*	2.02	-38.7*	7.91
Person food stamp reciency	2.1	48.1	28.9	46.0*	1.73	-26.8*	7.21

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 11. (Cont.) Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional GQ Types by Who Answered the Questions on the Questionnaire: 2008

Items	Who Answered						
	Sample						
	Person	Proxy	Both	Person-Proxy	Person-Both		
	%	%	%	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
	Alloc	Alloc	Alloc				
Juvenile facilities							
Race	2.6	1.3	9.1	1.3	2.38	-6.6	11.04
Hispanic origin	1.5	2.8	13.4	-1.3*	1.22	-11.9*	9.33
Sex	0.3	0.7	1.0	-0.4	0.45	-0.7	1.81
Age	4.2	3.2	0.9	1.0	1.78	3.3*	2.36
Date of birth	6.3	16.2	35.6	-9.8*	3.94	-29.3*	28.16
Citizenship	0.2	7.0	11.9	-6.8*	2.70	-11.7	18.50
Educational attainment	6.2	22.1	17.4	-15.9*	4.93	-11.2	18.16
Marital status	0.7	15.1	6.0	-14.5*	6.32	-5.4	9.11
Veteran status	1.4	20.7	23.9	-19.3*	8.75	-22.4	31.51
When last worked	4.5	31.2	30.6	-26.7*	6.77	-26.1	35.13
Person food stamp reciprocity	4.1	24.2	23.2	-20.2*	5.75	-19.2	19.74
Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities							
Race	0.4	1.2	0.7	-0.9*	0.32	-0.3	0.41
Hispanic origin	0.9	2.8	0.6	-2.0*	0.54	0.3*	0.28
Sex	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.10	0.0	0.22
Age	0.5	0.7	0.5	-0.1	0.22	0.1	0.32
Date of birth	2.1	3.7	1.7	-1.6*	0.95	0.4	0.67
Citizenship	1.5	9.7	1.5	-8.1*	1.08	0.1	0.72
Educational attainment	7.1	37.0	10.2	-29.9*	1.64	-3.1*	1.97
Marital status	1.8	8.0	3.3	-6.1*	0.89	-1.5*	1.46
Veteran status	3.0	19.9	4.8	-16.9*	1.21	-1.8*	1.58
When last worked	3.3	16.3	5.3	-13.0*	1.08	-2.0*	1.52
Person food stamp reciprocity	5.0	17.1	6.0	-12.1*	1.17	-1.0	1.52

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 11. (Cont.) Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional GQ Types by Who Answered the Questions on the Questionnaire: 2008

Items	Who Answered						
	Sample			Who Answered			
	Person	Proxy	Both	Person-Proxy	Person-Both		
	%	%	%	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
	Alloc	Alloc	Alloc				
Other institutional facilities							
Race	0.2	1.5	0.0	-1.4*	1.12	0.2	0.20
Hispanic origin	1.5	4.1	0.0	-2.6*	2.34	1.5*	0.80
Sex	0.0	0.6	0.0	-0.6*	0.40	0.0	0.00
Age	2.2	8.2	4.6	-6.0*	4.78	-2.4	5.73
Date of birth	2.8	16.9	4.6	-14.1*	7.11	-1.8	5.76
Citizenship	3.7	17.6	2.1	-13.9*	6.73	1.6	3.45
Educational attainment	3.9	32.1	7.4	-28.2*	7.73	-3.6	11.49
Marital status	5.4	12.5	7.3	-7.2*	4.52	-2.0	13.87
Veteran status	2.6	24.7	11.4	-22.1*	6.75	-8.8	17.76
When last worked	18.0	40.3	15.6	-22.3*	8.27	2.4	11.49
Person food stamp reciprocity	3.2	26.1	38.0	-22.9*	7.01	-34.8*	31.05

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

In every institutional GQ type, data collected directly from the sample person were more complete. In instances where collecting data from the sample resident was not possible, the combination of the sample person and a proxy might have been the best reasonable alternative for collecting data, but in some GQs even this was problematic. The uses of proxy and sample residents' self-selection into this method in adult correctional facilities lead to poor data collection. One possible reason why this might have happened is that in adult correctional facilities, collecting data from proxy respondents was often done when prison residents refuse to participate in the survey, or when residents were not reachable at the time of the interview for security or other reasons, and the FR collected person level data through a proxy about the resident in sample using administrative records. The implications for using administrative records to collect person level data will be discussed at a later point in this analysis.

Noninstitutional

Item allocation rates in noninstitutional GQs were much lower when the sample resident rather than a proxy, or both the sample resident and a proxy completed the questionnaires. For questionnaires completed by the sample resident, the allocation rates ranged from as low as 0.1 percent for the sex item to as high as 7.4 percent for the employment status recode (Table 12).

Regardless of how the questionnaire was completed, that is, by sample resident, proxy, or both the sample resident and a proxy, the allocation rates for the selected variables were highest for the employment status recode and when last worked items. The allocation rates for the employment status recode and when last worked items were 7.4 percent and 4.3 percent if the questionnaire was completed by the sample resident, compared with 43.4 percent and 51.6 percent if a proxy completed the questionnaire. If both the sample resident and proxy completed the questionnaire, the allocation rates were about 21 percent for each item.

At college/university student housing, questionnaires completed by proxy yielded higher allocation rates than when the sample person completed the questionnaire. When a proxy completed the questionnaire, the three items with significantly higher allocation rates were: 1) when last worked (89.0 percent), 2) employment status recode (78.4 percent), and 3) food stamp (63.3 percent). When both the sample resident and proxy completed the questionnaire, the highest allocation rates were for when last worked (44.7 percent) and employment status recode (42.7 percent), which showed no statistical difference from each other. The lowest allocation rate was for age.

Similarly, at military quarters when a proxy completed the questionnaire, the allocation rates for the selected items were much higher than when a sample person completed the questionnaire. Most of the items had allocation rates above 10 percent, except for veteran status and employment status recode which had allocation rates of 8.4 and 5 percent respectively, and were not significantly different from each other. The educational attainment and the food stamp reciprocity items had the highest allocation rates (38.5 percent and 40.5 percent, respectively), which were not significantly different from each other.

In other noninstitutional group quarter's facilities, the allocation rates for the demographic characteristics are similar regardless of who completed the questionnaire. However, for the social characteristics items, the allocation rates were lower when a sample resident or both the sample resident and a proxy answered the questionnaire. When only a proxy answered the questionnaire, the allocation rates ranged from 12.0 percent for marital status to 35.8 percent for educational attainment.

Table 12. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population
By Who Answered the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in
2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Who Answered						
	Sample			Person-Proxy		Person-Both	
	Person	Proxy	Both	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc				
Noninstitutional							
Race	0.9	13.8	1.6	-12.9*	1.10	-0.7	0.81
Hispanic origin	1.0	14.5	2.6	-13.5*	1.22	-1.6*	1.12
Sex	0.1	0.3	0.5	-0.2*	0.10	-0.4*	0.30
Age	0.4	1.3	0.7	-1.0*	0.41	-0.3	0.51
Date of birth	2.6	11.1	8.1	-8.5*	1.14	-5.6*	2.62
Citizenship	1.0	23.4	6.3	-22.3*	1.51	-5.2*	2.51
Educational attainment	1.9	32.2	14.8	-30.3*	1.92	-12.8*	3.51
Marital status	1.4	25.2	11.5	-23.8*	1.51	-10.1*	3.31
Veteran status	1.9	33.4	11.7	-31.5*	1.82	-9.8*	3.01
Employment status recode	7.4	43.4	21.0	-36.1*	1.65	-13.6*	3.42
When last worked	4.3	51.6	20.7	-47.3*	1.82	-16.3*	3.51
Person food stamp reciprocity	2.6	39.2	12.3	-36.7*	1.63	-9.7*	3.51
College/university student housing							
Race	0.8	27.5	3.5	-26.7*	2.30	-2.7*	2.10
Hispanic origin	0.8	28.6	4.1	-27.8*	2.41	-3.3*	2.21
Sex	0.1	0.3	0.9	-0.3*	0.20	-0.8	0.90
Age	0.4	1.2	0.8	-0.8*	0.61	-0.4	0.81
Date of birth	2.2	13.4	16.8	-11.1*	1.73	-14.5*	6.21
Citizenship	1.0	38.8	14.4	-37.8*	2.52	-13.4*	7.31
Educational attainment	1.2	27.2	14.5	-26.0*	2.71	-13.3*	6.90
Marital status	1.3	41.7	23.2	-40.4*	2.62	-21.9*	7.61
Veteran status	1.7	53.0	26.2	-51.3*	3.01	-24.5*	8.11
Employment status recode	8.1	78.4	42.7	-70.4*	2.45	-34.7*	7.42
When last worked	3.9	89.0	44.7	-85.1*	2.04	-40.8*	8.31
Person food stamp reciprocity	2.3	63.4	23.1	-61.1*	2.53	-20.9*	9.51

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Table 12. (Cont.) Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ
Population By Who Answered the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ)
Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Who Answered						
	Sample			Person-Proxy		Person-Both	
	Person	Proxy	Both	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc				
Military quarters facilities							
Race	0.9	21.5	7.0	-20.6*	7.42	-6.1	13.91
Hispanic origin	0.5	11.6	2.6	-11.0*	5.41	-2.1	4.01
Sex	0.1	0.2	0.0	-0.2	0.32	0.1	0.10
Age	0.2	0.5	0.0	-0.3	0.41	0.2*	0.10
Date of birth	2.6	10.1	3.9	-7.5*	3.58	-1.2	7.91
Citizenship	0.4	26.3	8.6	-26.0*	5.01	-8.2	18.80
Educational attainment	1.1	38.5	13.6	-37.4*	6.40	-12.5	24.42
Marital status	0.7	15.2	4.4	-14.5*	6.24	-3.7	10.72
Veteran status	0.7	8.4	4.4	-7.8*	3.32	-3.7	10.71
Employment status recode	1.8	4.9	5.7	-3.0*	2.43	-3.9	5.51
When last worked	3.2	17.6	10.1	-14.5*	4.74	-6.9	9.32
Person food stamp reciprocity	0.8	40.5	15.1	-39.7*	6.61	-14.3	26.50
Other noninstitutional facilities							
Race	1.1	1.8	0.5	-0.8	0.95	0.6*	0.50
Hispanic origin	2.0	3.2	2.0	-1.3*	1.21	0.0	1.58
Sex	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.28	-0.1	0.45
Age	0.4	1.5	0.7	-1.1*	0.51	-0.2	0.61
Date of birth	3.5	9.2	4.4	-5.8*	1.93	-0.9	2.60
Citizenship	1.4	10.4	2.5	-9.0*	2.06	-1.1	1.12
Educational attainment	4.5	35.8	15.0	-31.4*	2.69	-10.5*	4.46
Marital status	1.9	12.0	6.3	-10.0*	1.75	-4.4*	3.82
Veteran status	3.0	18.8	5.2	-15.8*	2.40	-2.2	3.67
Employment status recode	8.0	16.8	11.4	-8.9*	2.28	-3.5	3.57
When last worked	6.1	22.5	9.9	-16.5*	2.60	-3.8	4.71
Person food stamp reciprocity	4.1	19.2	7.2	-15.1*	2.56	-3.1	3.71

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level
Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Is there a difference in item allocation rates based on the methodology used to collect the data (self-response, face-to-face, or telephone)?

Institutional

Table 13 shows the 2008 item allocation rates based on the methodology used to collect the data. Three methods are considered. The preferred method of data collection (personal visit) is compared to self-response, telephone, and a combination of methods. Differences between the item allocation rates for personal visit and the three other methods are displayed. In institutional GQs, interviews conducted by telephone yielded higher allocation rates for all of the selected characteristics, except for sex and age. High allocation rates are found in telephone interviews for educational attainment, food stamps reciprocity, veteran status, and when last worked. Self-response item allocation rates were significantly different to the allocation rates based on personal visit, for all but one item (veteran status). For the social characteristics, self-response yielded lower allocation rates than personal visit for most of the items. No self-response items had extremely high item allocation rates.

For adult correctional facilities, self-response yielded lower allocation rates for most of the social characteristics, except for when last worked item, for which personal interview yielded the lower allocation rate. Item allocation rates for interviews completed by telephone were higher than those for personal visit for all social characteristics.

In juvenile and nursing facilities, item allocation rates for the selected characteristics are higher for interviews conducted by telephone compared to personal interviews. The final allocation rates for interviews conducted by telephone in these GQs were very high for the social characteristics, but for the basic demographic characteristics such as race, age, and sex they were not. Self-response allocation rates were similar to the rates for interviews conducted by personal visit.

Item allocation rates for most of the selected items show little variation when personal or telephone interviews are used in other institutional facilities.

Since residents of institutional facilities are for the most part unreachable by telephone and the data obtained through proxy in these GQ types are most likely obtained from administrative records, telephone and combination generally had higher allocation rates relative to personal interview. Data collected by self-response in adult correctional facilities were generally more complete, while data collected by personal interview in juvenile facilities, nursing facilities, and other institutional facilities were generally more complete.

Table 13. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology Used to Collect the Data in 2008: Institutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by									
	Per	Tel	Self	Comb	Per-Tel		Per-Self		Per-Comb	
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Institutional										
Race	0.9	2.9	2.8	3.0	-1.9*	1.51	-1.8*	0.54	-2.0*	1.32
Hispanic origin	1.9	6.6	5.0	6.1	-4.7*	2.91	-3.1*	0.63	-4.3*	1.61
Sex	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.20	0.1*	0.10	0.1	0.10
Age	0.6	1.0	1.5	0.8	-0.5	0.81	-1.0*	0.71	-0.3	0.91
Date of birth	2.2	17.2	3.8	7.9	-15.0*	7.40	-1.6*	0.92	-5.7*	2.11
Citizenship	4.4	23.8	2.2	16.5	-19.5*	7.71	2.2*	0.76	-12.2*	2.82
Educational attainment	18.0	50.4	7.1	34.2	-32.4*	6.82	10.9*	1.21	-16.2*	3.83
Marital status	6.0	27.5	4.3	19.7	-21.5*	5.81	1.7*	1.08	-13.7*	3.13
Veteran status	10.0	46.1	9.3	31.4	-36.1*	6.71	0.8	1.55	-21.4*	3.82
When last worked	12.9	47.8	17.3	33.0	-34.9*	6.52	-4.4*	1.87	-20.1*	3.54
Person food stamp reciprocity	11.0	42.1	7.5	27.0	-31.1*	7.51	3.5*	1.94	-16.0*	3.62
Adult correctional facilities										
Race	1.0	3.2	3.2	4.7	-2.1	2.41	-2.2*	0.54	-3.6*	1.71
Hispanic origin	1.8	4.6	5.8	12.5	-2.8	3.81	-4.0*	0.82	-10.7*	2.41
Sex	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.32	0.1	0.14	-0.1	0.32
Age	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.2*	0.10	-0.2	0.22	-0.2	0.41
Date of birth	1.1	6.8	1.7	10.9	-5.7*	3.81	-0.6*	0.45	-9.7*	1.61
Citizenship	2.6	18.4	1.7	27.5	-15.8*	6.81	0.9*	0.76	-24.9*	4.31
Educational attainment	12.0	53.6	4.6	46.4	-41.6*	9.82	7.5*	1.00	-34.4*	5.23
Marital status	6.7	47.8	3.4	39.1	-41.1*	8.71	3.3*	0.81	-32.4*	5.41
Veteran status	7.8	51.2	8.1	51.1	-43.3*	9.01	-0.3	1.77	-43.3*	6.02
When last worked	14.7	64.1	17.9	55.2	-49.4*	7.52	-3.2*	1.90	-40.5*	5.23
Person food stamp reciprocity	10.0	48.2	7.3	41.6	-38.2*	10.11	2.7*	2.35	-31.5*	5.52

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level
 Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 13. (Cont.) Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology Used to Collect the Data in 2008: Institutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by									
	Per	Tel	Self	Comb	Per-Tel		Per-Self		Per-Comb	
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Juveniles facilities										
Race	1.9	6.7	1.4	7.3	-4.9	5.46	0.5	2.14	-5.4	9.39
Hispanic origin	2.0	14.2	2.2	12.2	-12.2*	9.53	-0.2	2.06	-10.2	11.03
Sex	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.8	-0.6	1.24	0.5*	0.30	-0.3	1.43
Age	3.2	6.8	5.6	1.9	-3.7	6.35	-2.4	5.26	1.3	2.62
Date of birth	8.6	33.5	18.3	37.9	-24.9*	15.33	-9.7	9.90	-29.2*	27.17
Citizenship	4.2	19.9	0.0	15.0	-15.7*	12.41	4.2*	2.30	-10.8	15.47
Educational attainment	11.8	47.3	13.9	26.5	-35.6*	20.38	-2.1	7.32	-14.8	19.59
Marital status	4.8	22.1	12.8	23.5	-17.3*	16.28	-8.0*	7.87	-18.7*	17.66
Veteran status	6.7	33.9	16.0	48.4	-27.2*	19.42	-9.2*	8.82	-41.6*	26.43
When last worked	12.4	42.2	24.7	51.8	-29.8*	21.51	-12.3*	12.08	-39.5*	23.99
Person food stamp reciprocity	12.8	33.4	10.0	25.6	-20.6*	16.57	2.8	7.03	-12.8	20.90
Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities										
Race	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.8	0.0	0.85	-0.5	0.95	-1.0	1.92
Hispanic origin	1.9	5.9	1.6	2.4	-4.0	5.12	0.3	0.98	-0.5	1.94
Sex	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.20	-0.1	0.30	0.1*	0.10
Age	0.6	0.6	4.4	0.2	0.0	0.91	-3.8	4.40	0.4*	0.14
Date of birth	2.6	23.0	7.4	4.1	-20.4*	14.21	-4.8*	4.42	-1.5	2.43
Citizenship	5.9	31.6	4.6	10.9	-25.7*	13.71	1.4	3.04	-5.0*	3.54
Educational attainment	24.7	50.7	16.0	28.1	-26.0*	10.34	8.7*	4.88	-3.3	5.57
Marital status	5.2	10.8	6.5	9.7	-5.6*	5.22	-1.3	4.03	-4.5*	3.14
Veteran status	12.4	44.7	15.6	20.7	-32.4*	10.62	-3.2	4.85	-8.3*	5.05
When last worked	10.3	36.3	12.2	20.7	-26.0*	12.82	-1.9	5.05	-10.4*	4.95
Person food stamp reciprocity	11.8	40.9	8.2	19.2	-29.1*	12.91	3.6*	2.96	-7.5*	5.04

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 13. (Cont.) Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology Used to Collect the Data in 2008: Institutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by										
	Per	Tel	Self	Comb	Per-Tel		Per-Self		Per-Comb		
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	
Other institutional facilities											
Race	0.6	13.4	0.1	3.4	-12.9	23.41	0.5	0.51	-2.8	4.03	
Hispanic origin	2.1	13.4	3.9	10.5	-11.4	23.42	-1.9	2.85	-8.4	9.04	
Sex	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4*	0.20	0.4*	0.20	0.4*	0.20	
Age	4.2	0.0	10.8	34.3	4.2*	2.40	-6.6	11.26	-30.1	40.07	
Date of birth	8.9	13.4	14.0	34.3	-4.5	23.69	-5.1	11.51	-25.4	40.17	
Citizenship	10.9	0.0	9.0	17.3	10.9*	3.80	1.9	7.96	-6.4	20.46	
Educational attainment	17.1	19.5	19.5	45.1	-2.4	22.73	-2.4	10.83	-28.1	33.89	
Marital status	9.1	14.6	6.3	8.9	-5.5	25.21	2.7	5.87	0.2	8.81	
Veteran status	12.0	17.6	7.2	49.6	-5.6	25.05	4.8	5.24	-37.6*	27.72	
When last worked	28.9	11.3	13.9	50.6	17.7	19.97	15.0*	5.54	-21.7	26.55	
Person food stamp reciprocity	14.1	13.4	6.6	37.9	0.7	23.69	7.5*	5.98	-23.8	32.11	

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Noninstitutional

Table 14 shows the allocation rates for the noninstitutionalized GQ population. Within college/university student housing and military quarters, the allocation rates for the demographic and social characteristics were consistently lower when the sample person interviews were completed by self-response, rather than by personal visit.

When the sample person data was collected using only a single mode (personal, telephone, and self-response) the allocation rates were not very high in college/university housing or military quarters facilities. However, when more than one method was used to collect person level data, the allocation rates were extremely high in college/university housing – as high as 64.8 percent for when last worked.

In noninstitutional GQ facilities, once a FR or GQ contact person has contacted selected sample residents about the survey, the residents have the alternative to self-select the preferred method to answer the survey questions. Those respondents that select telephone interview as the preferred method, have access to a telephone, and may see it as a convenient tool. They are not necessarily suspicious about providing all applicable person level data by telephone.

When a combination of methods to collect person level data was used, item allocation rates were high for most of the characteristics. Although we cannot say for certain why using this method of data collection yielded high item allocation rates, we assume that respondent inability or reluctance to complete the questionnaire either by personal interview, telephone, or by self-response are more likely not to provide all applicable data regardless of how many or what methods are used to conduct the interviews.

For example, FR procedures state that the FR must attempt to contact the respondent when a portion of the questionnaire completed through self-response was left blank. If the respondent was reluctant to answer those questions by self-response, the respondent may also be reluctant to provide it when the FR follows up, despite the combination of modes attempted. Similarly, when a personal interview is partially conducted and the FR has to follow-up by telephone to complete the interview, telephone calls scheduling conflict may play a role, even after a convenient time has been previously agreed between the FR and the respondent.

It should be noted that the FRs are instructed to always attempt to collect all applicable answers to the person level questions by using as many methods as possible. Therefore, the occurrence of high item allocation rates when multiple methods of data collection are used are not necessarily as a result of the multiple attempts, but the underlying causes that motivated the use of multiple methods to collect the data.

Table 14. Allocation rates for selected sample items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology Used to Collect the Data in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by										
	Per	Tel	Self	Comb	Per-Tel	Per-Self	Per-Comb				
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Diff	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	
Noninstitutional											
Race	5.0	5.0	1.2	11.6	0.0	1.08	3.8*	0.67	-6.6*	2.09	
Hispanic origin	5.6	5.6	1.2	9.8	0.0	1.08	4.4*	0.67	-4.1*	2.09	
Sex	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.14	0.2*	0.14	0.2*	0.14	
Age	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.2	0.28	0.5*	0.22	0.2	0.36	
Date of birth	5.7	6.1	1.6	10.5	-0.4	1.00	4.1*	0.67	-4.8*	2.09	
Citizenship	9.0	9.3	0.5	17.2	-0.3	1.36	8.5*	0.81	-8.2*	3.10	
Educational attainment	14.3	9.8	1.6	17.0	4.5*	1.72	12.7*	1.04	-2.8	3.16	
Marital status	9.7	9.4	1.5	17.5	0.3	1.48	8.2*	0.76	-7.9*	3.28	
Veteran status	12.6	13.6	1.9	24.0	-1.0	1.84	10.7*	0.98	-11.4*	3.91	
Employment status recode	20.1	21.9	5.9	35.0	-1.8	1.88	14.2*	0.94	-14.9*	3.79	
When last worked	20.7	20.9	4.3	41.2	-0.2	1.97	16.3*	1.12	-20.6*	3.93	
Person food stamp reciprocity	15.8	15.0	2.2	29.5	0.8	1.92	13.6*	0.95	-13.7*	4.00	
College/university student housing											
Race	9.1	5.3	1.0	17.7	3.8*	1.42	8.1*	1.12	-8.6*	3.10	
Hispanic origin	9.5	6.1	0.9	16.4	3.4*	1.49	8.6*	1.12	-6.9*	3.29	
Sex	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.14	0.1	0.14	0.0	0.22	
Age	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.50	0.6*	0.41	0.4	0.50	
Date of birth	5.4	5.5	1.2	15.3	-0.1	1.20	4.2*	0.82	-9.9*	3.10	
Citizenship	12.9	8.9	0.4	25.9	4.1*	1.70	12.5*	1.20	-13.0*	4.75	
Educational attainment	9.3	6.4	1.1	16.1	2.9*	1.70	8.1*	1.24	-6.9*	4.75	
Marital status	13.8	9.7	1.1	27.8	4.2*	1.84	12.8*	1.22	-14.0*	5.63	
Veteran status	17.1	13.2	1.5	37.9	3.8*	2.19	15.6*	1.53	-20.8*	6.57	
Employment status recode	31.1	23.4	6.3	57.6	7.8*	2.27	24.8*	1.55	-26.5*	5.32	
When last worked	31.0	21.1	3.3	64.8	9.9*	2.27	27.7*	1.55	-33.8*	5.22	
Person food stamp reciprocity	21.8	14.3	1.9	41.4	7.48*	2.14	9.9*	1.33	-19.6*	6.24	

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level
 Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 14. (Cont.) Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology Used to Collect the Data in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by									
	Per	Tel	Self	Comb	Per-Tel	Per-Self	Per-Comb			
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Military quarters facilities										
Race	4.4	3.7	2.1	9.0	0.7	3.86	2.3	2.69	-4.6	5.85
Hispanic origin	3.9	1.3	0.6	0.9	2.6*	2.06	3.3*	1.90	2.9*	2.06
Sex	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	-0.5	0.71	0.1	0.10	0.1	0.10
Age	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.30	0.0	0.36	-0.1	0.50
Date of birth	5.6	8.1	1.2	1.8	-2.5	5.49	4.4*	3.04	3.8*	3.20
Citizenship	4.5	9.9	0.6	11.9	-5.4*	4.68	4.0*	1.43	-7.4*	6.24
Educational attainment	7.7	9.1	0.5	24.6	-1.4	4.48	7.2*	2.24	-16.9*	7.91
Marital status	4.4	2.4	0.9	3.8	2.1	3.68	3.5*	2.85	0.6	3.55
Veteran status	2.5	1.6	0.6	4.3	0.9	1.77	1.9*	1.26	-1.9	2.68
Employment status recode	2.3	4.3	1.5	3.1	-2.0	2.38	0.8	1.08	-0.8	1.66
When last worked	5.2	7.2	3.2	12.3	-1.9	3.58	2.0*	1.61	-7.1*	4.62
Person food stamp reciprocity	7.1	11.7	0.9	24.3	-4.6*	4.43	6.2*	1.96	-17.2*	7.83
Other noninstitutional facilities										
Race	1.1	2.7	1.7	2.8	-1.6	2.45	-0.6	0.78	-1.7	2.26
Hispanic origin	2.1	3.5	3.3	3.6	-1.4	2.75	-1.1	1.30	-1.5	2.16
Sex	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.41	0.3*	0.14	0.3*	0.10
Age	0.9	1.5	0.6	1.1	-0.6	1.04	0.3	0.50	-0.2	0.85
Date of birth	6.0	9.9	3.9	7.2	-4.0	4.51	2.1*	1.72	-1.3	3.74
Citizenship	6.0	12.9	0.7	5.5	-6.9*	5.07	5.3*	1.33	0.4	3.45
Educational attainment	20.2	39.6	4.5	14.3	-19.3*	7.40	15.8*	2.14	6.0*	4.72
Marital status	6.4	11.1	4.2	7.8	-4.7*	4.41	2.2*	1.89	-1.4	3.45
Veteran status	9.8	24.0	5.2	11.5	-14.2*	7.63	4.6*	2.44	-1.7	4.90
Employment status recode	12.2	19.7	7.8	14.5	-7.6*	6.45	4.4*	2.28	-2.3	4.24
When last worked	12.9	27.3	10.4	17.4	-14.4*	7.75	2.5	2.83	-4.5	6.18
Person food stamp reciprocity	11.3	22.8*	4.9	12.5	-11.5	7.84	6.4*	2.12	-1.1	4.93

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level
 Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent

Is there a difference in item allocation rates based on the use of administrative records to collect GQ survey person level data?

Institutional

Based on 2008 data, Table 15 shows the allocation rate for selected items for the institutionalized GQ population by use of administrative records. For the most part, administrative records are used when FRs are unable to obtain person level data directly from the sample person or from a knowledgeable proxy that is able to provide data about the sample person. Item allocation rates for interviews based on some use and full use of administrative records are compared with item allocation rates when administrative records were not used. No use of administrative records to answer the demographic questions in institutional GQs yielded lower allocation rates than either use option for most (but not all) items. The use of some or only administrative records resulted in small increases in item allocation rates for a subset of the demographic items. When no administrative records were used, the allocation rates for the social characteristics were very low. For these social characteristics the use of some administrative records resulted in moderate increases in allocation rates for all six items. Using only administrative records led to even greater increases in allocation rates for every item.

When assessing how the use of administrative records contributed to item allocation by GQ type, Table 15 shows that in adult correctional facilities, using administrative records to answer some or all the questions, resulted in a much higher allocation rate for most of the social characteristics than when no administrative records were used. The allocation rates for most of the demographic and social characteristics when no administrative records were used were low (less than 5 percent). When administrative records were used to answer some or all the characteristics, the allocation rate rose to levels as high as 71.5 percent. The reason that these rates are so high may be due to the fact that answers to these questions are not generally available in administrative records at adult correctional facilities.

In juvenile facilities, there were only minor differences found in the item allocation rates for when no administrative records were used compared to when administrative records were used to answer some of the selected characteristics. In contrast, when only administrative records were used, the allocation rates were much higher than when no administrative records were used for eight of the eleven items.

For nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities, when no administrative records were used, all the demographic and social characteristics items had allocation rates at or below 4.1 percent. When administrative records were used to answer some of the questions, the allocation rates rose for all the social characteristics to rates as high as 21.4 percent (educational attainment). When administrative records were used to answer all of the questions, the allocation rates for most of the social characteristics were considerably higher than when no administrative records were used. Educational attainment had the highest allocation rate (38.8 percentage points).

Table 15. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Institutional

Items	Administrative Records Use						
	No	Some	All	No-Some	No-All		
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Institutional							
Race	0.9	0.7	1.7	0.2	0.28	-0.8*	0.36
Hispanic origin	1.3	1.4	4.0	-0.1	0.41	-2.7*	0.51
Sex	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.10	-0.1	0.10
Age	0.4	1.0	0.8	-0.6*	0.51	-0.4*	0.22
Date of birth	1.5	3.9	3.9	-2.4*	1.12	-2.3*	0.63
Citizenship	0.5	4.4	12.1	-3.9*	1.00	-11.6*	0.91
Educational attainment	2.3	23.4	41.6	-21.2*	1.91	-39.3*	1.12
Marital status	1.0	5.5	15.9	-4.5*	1.00	-14.9*	0.91
Veteran status	1.7	10.7	26.7	-9.1*	1.71	-25.0*	1.02
When last worked	3.1	10.4	34.6	-7.3*	1.33	-31.5*	0.95
Person food stamp reciprocity	2.2	10.6	27.1	-8.4*	1.43	-24.9*	1.04
Adult correctional facilities							
Race	1.0	1.4	2.1	-0.3	0.82	-1.1*	0.45
Hispanic origin	1.4	3.4	5.5	-2.0*	1.51	-4.1*	0.63
Sex	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.30	-0.3*	0.10
Age	0.2	0.3	0.4	-0.1	0.32	-0.2*	0.14
Date of birth	1.0	2.6	2.8	-1.6	1.70	-1.8*	0.51
Citizenship	0.5	12.2	14.5	-11.8*	3.90	-14.0*	1.60
Educational attainment	1.8	51.2	52.3	-49.3*	4.90	-50.4*	1.91
Marital status	0.8	26.3	32.4	-25.5*	6.50	-31.6*	1.40
Veteran status	1.6	30.8	39.0	-29.3*	5.51	-37.5*	1.92
When last worked	3.2	47.9	71.5	-44.7*	6.91	-68.3*	1.63
Person food stamp reciprocity	1.5	33.2	46.8	-31.7*	6.61	-45.2*	1.63
Juvenile facilities							
Race	2.7	2.2	1.7	0.5	4.08	0.9	2.50
Hispanic origin	0.9	4.4	4.8	-3.4	4.31	-3.9*	1.82
Sex	0.3	0.0	0.8	0.3*	0.20	-0.5	0.54
Age	4.0	2.3	3.0	1.6	1.70	0.9	1.63
Date of birth	6.3	18.9	16.0	-12.6	13.69	-9.7*	4.68
Citizenship	0.2	0.8	10.9	-0.6	0.63	-10.7*	4.70
Educational attainment	6.1	7.3	25.6	-1.2	4.33	-19.5*	5.58
Marital status	0.7	2.5	17.0	-1.8	2.35	-16.3*	7.22
Veteran status	0.7	3.5	25.4	-2.9	2.94	-24.7*	9.81
When last worked	4.4	8.9	36.5	-4.5	6.87	-32.1*	7.45
Person food stamp reciprocity	3.7	7.9	27.6	-4.2*	3.83	-23.9*	6.73

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 15. (Cont.) Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ
Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions
on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Institutional

Items	Administrative Records Use						
	No	Some	All	No-Some		No-All	
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities							
Race	0.3	0.5	1.5	-0.2	0.22	-1.2*	0.41
Hispanic origin	0.7	0.9	3.2	-0.2	0.45	-2.5*	0.63
Sex	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.14	0.1	0.10
Age	0.6	0.8	0.6	-0.2	0.54	0.1	0.28
Date of birth	2.5	3.2	3.2	-0.7	1.17	-0.7	0.89
Citizenship	0.6	3.7	10.9	-3.1*	1.10	-10.3*	1.00
Educational attainment	3.0	21.4	38.8	-18.4*	2.24	-35.7*	1.46
Marital status	1.4	3.3	9.0	-1.8*	0.89	-7.5*	0.98
Veteran status	1.9	8.6	21.6	-6.7*	1.77	-19.8*	1.30
When last worked	2.7	6.7	18.0	-4.0*	1.34	-15.3*	1.17
Person food stamp reciprocity	4.1	8.4	18.8	-4.3*	1.39	-14.7*	1.21
Other institutional facilities							
Race	0.7	3.2	1.4	-2.5	5.35	-0.7	1.39
Hispanic origin	2.0	9.4	5.1	-7.4	10.16	-3.1	4.83
Sex	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.00	-0.5*	0.30
Age	2.9	11.5	5.3	-8.6	10.90	-2.4	4.17
Date of birth	3.6	14.7	11.9	-11.1	12.18	-8.4*	5.79
Citizenship	1.2	10.9	15.4	-9.7	9.82	-14.2*	4.95
Educational attainment	4.5	28.9	23.6	-24.4*	15.11	-19.1*	6.36
Marital status	3.4	23.4	9.9	-20.0*	15.41	-6.5*	3.67
Veteran status	2.9	30.3	20.3	-27.4*	15.89	-17.4*	7.30
When last worked	4.1	23.0	45.0	-18.8*	12.81	-40.8*	6.43
Person food stamp reciprocity	3.9	19.2	22.9	-15.3*	13.61	-19.0*	7.31

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Noninstitutional

Table 16 shows that when administrative records were not used in noninstitutional GQs to answer the person level survey questions, the allocation rates for nearly all the demographic and social characteristics were lower compared to when administrative records were used to answer some or all of the questions, regardless of the GQ type. When no administrative records were used to answer all the demographic and social characteristics, allocation rates were at or below 4.0 percent, except for the employment status recode (7.2 percent). When administrative records were used to answer all the questions, all of the social characteristics had allocation rates at or above 27.1 percent.

When analyzing data for college/university student housing and military quarters, we found a similar pattern. That is, item allocation rates were lower when no administrative records were used to answer the selected questions and higher when administrative records were used.

When administrative records were used to answer some or all the items, the allocation rates rose for several of the demographic items in both colleges and military quarters. Particularly, for race and Hispanic origin in college/university student housing, when all of the items were answered using solely administrative records, the allocation rates were about 30 percent. The allocation rate for social characteristics in colleges/university student housing when only administrative records were used, ranged from 29.2 percent for educational attainment to 90.1 percent for when last worked.

Similarly, in military quarters, when no administrative records were used, the allocation rates for the demographic characteristics were below 4.0 percent. When administrative records were used to answer some or all the questions, the allocation rate rose to levels as high as 43.3 percent.

Table 16. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Administrative Records Use						
	No	Some	All	No-Some	No-All		
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Noninstitutional							
Race	0.8	6.2	15.5	-5.4*	1.70	-14.7*	1.30
Hispanic origin	0.9	6.6	16.6	-5.6*	1.70	-15.7*	1.40
Sex	0.1	0.3	0.3	-0.2	0.22	-0.1	0.14
Age	0.5	0.6	1.0	-0.1	0.51	-0.5*	0.41
Date of birth	3.0	8.6	9.7	-5.6*	1.43	-6.7*	1.24
Citizenship	0.7	9.8	27.1	-9.0*	1.70	-26.3*	1.70
Educational attainment	1.7	20.0	34.0	-18.3*	2.52	-32.3*	1.82
Marital status	1.1	10.5	29.0	-9.4*	2.01	-27.9*	1.71
Veteran status	1.6	13.6	37.8	-12.0*	2.11	-36.2*	2.01
Employment status recode	7.2	26.3	46.1	-19.1*	2.83	-38.9*	1.94
When last worked	4.0	28.3	55.4	-24.3*	2.62	-51.4*	2.02
Person food stamp reciprocity	2.1	18.3	44.6	-16.2*	2.31	-42.5*	1.81
College/university student housing							
Race	0.7	12.2	30.2	-11.5*	3.10	-29.4*	2.50
Hispanic origin	0.7	12.3	31.5	-11.5*	3.41	-30.8*	2.61
Sex	0.1	0.2	0.3	-0.1	0.20	-0.2	0.30
Age	0.5	1.0	0.9	-0.5	1.20	-0.4	0.61
Date of birth	2.6	14.1	11.7	-11.5*	3.62	-9.1*	1.65
Citizenship	0.7	20.9	42.3	-20.2*	4.10	-41.6*	2.61
Educational attainment	1.2	15.8	29.2	-14.6*	3.71	-28.0*	2.71
Marital status	0.9	20.5	46.5	-19.7*	4.10	-45.6*	2.61
Veteran status	1.3	28.0	57.7	-26.6*	4.30	-56.4*	3.11
Employment status recode	7.8	56.5	79.6	-48.7*	4.63	-71.7*	2.65
When last worked	3.5	63.5	90.1	-60.0*	5.01	-86.6*	2.22
Person food stamp reciprocity	1.8	35.0	67.5	-33.2*	4.81	-65.7*	2.62

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 16. (Cont.) Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions on the ACS- 1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Administrative Records Use						
	No	Some	All	No-Some		No-All	
	% Alloc	% Alloc	% Alloc	Dif	Margin of Error Dif	Dif	Margin of Error Dif
Military quarters facilities							
Race	0.9	9.0	23.0	-8.1*	6.22	-22.0*	8.41
Hispanic origin	0.6	7.4	12.3	-6.9*	5.61	-11.7*	6.81
Sex	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.10	-0.2	0.32
Age	0.2	0.2	0.6	-0.1	0.41	-0.5	0.61
Date of Birth	2.9	6.5	7.7	-3.6	3.67	-4.8*	3.50
Citizenship	0.5	12.1	26.4	-11.6*	6.51	-25.9*	6.01
Educational attainment	1.3	21.0	37.7	-19.7*	9.17	-36.4*	7.09
Marital status	0.8	2.5	22.5	-1.7	2.31	-21.7*	6.74
Veteran status	0.7	2.4	11.6	-1.7	2.83	-11.0*	4.52
Employment status recode	1.8	3.2	8.1	-1.4	2.06	-6.3*	4.03
When last worked	3.1	6.8	22.2	-3.8*	3.26	-19.1*	5.93
Person food stamp reciprocity	1.0	22.8	43.3	-21.9*	9.50	-42.3*	6.81
Other noninstitutional facilities							
Race	1.1	2.6	1.2	-1.5	2.32	-0.2	0.50
Hispanic origin	1.7	3.3	3.3	-1.6	2.33	-1.6*	0.89
Sex	0.3	0.4	0.2	-0.2	0.36	0.1	0.28
Age	0.9	0.4	1.1	0.4*	0.36	-0.3	0.58
Date of birth	4.4	5.8	8.1	-1.4	2.02	-3.7*	2.12
Citizenship	1.1	3.3	13.0	-2.2*	1.17	-11.9*	2.43
Educational attainment	3.4	22.3	38.0	-18.9*	3.65	-34.7*	2.77
Marital status	2.0	5.5	13.1	-3.4*	1.68	-11.1*	1.96
Veteran status	2.9	6.4	21.6	-3.4*	1.93	-18.7*	2.79
Employment status recode	8.1	11.1	18.2	-3.0*	2.42	-10.1*	2.69
When last worked	5.9	10.0	25.7	-4.2*	2.51	-19.9*	2.97
Person food stamp reciprocity	3.5	8.5	23.4	-5.0*	1.90	-19.9*	2.77

*Statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

E. CONCLUSION

Several factors were taken into account in the analysis of item allocation rates for this study. As expected, item allocation rates for the selected demographic characteristics were lower than the allocation rates for the selected social characteristics. Of particular concern are the high allocation rates for the marital status, when last worked and employment status recode characteristics, which show an increase in item allocation of 5 and 10 percentage points respectively, in 2008. The consistent increase in allocation rates for marital status is likely due to the revision made to the questionnaire in 2008, which moved this question from the front section to the back pages of the instrument with marital history. When comparing item allocation by institutional/noninstitutional GQ facilities, the study found that the highest increase in item allocation rates occurred in noninstitutional GQ facilities.

When comparing item allocation rates by the methodology used to collect the data, in general, item allocation rates were lower for persons interviewed by self-response in adult correctional facilities, while person level interviews with the sample resident provided more complete data in juvenile and nursing/skilled-nursing facilities. In noninstitutional facilities, interviews by self-response seem to yield lower allocation rates than interviews in person or by telephone.

We must take into consideration that in many instances respondents self-select into these modes of data collection, thus we cannot conclusively state that the use of a proxy in the collection of person level data is the problem. Reluctant respondents may provide equally incomplete data if interviewed in any mode. In some instances, proxy interviews are most likely the least cooperative respondents.

The use of administrative records, although an important tool in the GQ data collection operation, may not be suitable for collecting social characteristics data in GQs. For example, it does not appear suitable to collect data in adult correctional facilities and college/university student housing, both which consistently showed high item allocation rates for all the social characteristics when data are obtained from administrative records.

In conclusion, the data showed that item allocation rates in 2008 varied based upon which mode and method of data collection were used in the GQ operation. Identifying the most suitable modes and methods by specific GQ types may yield lower allocation rates.⁸

⁸ Some of the results from this evaluation might have been impacted by our criteria used to consider a sufficient partial interview and a completed interview. Schechter, S. (2010). *Final Results – Evaluation Studying the Effects from Changes made to the Criteria for Assigning Sufficient Partial and Completed Outcome Codes to Group Quarters Interviews*. ACSO Research and Evaluation Memorandum Series No. ACS-R&E-10-02, February 2, 2010.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Standard Errors for National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews Tables (1 – 4) shown in Section I.

Appendix B. Universe Counts and Margins of Error (MOEs) for each of the Tables (6 – 16) shown in Section II.

APPENDIX A

Table 1A. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews
Standard Errors (SEs): 2006, 2007, and 2008

Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews	Year and Standard Error (SE)		
	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE
Response Rates	0.03	0.05	0.10
Reasons for Noninterviews:			
Group Quarters Person Refusal	0.02	0.03	0.05
Unable to Locate Group Quarters Person	0.01	0.01	0.04
Resident Temporarily Absent	0.01	0.04	0.04
Language Problem	0.00	0.00	0.00
Insufficient Data	0.01	0.00	0.01
Group Quarters Person Other Reason	0.02	0.02	0.06
Whole Group Quarters Refusal	0.01	0.00	0.04
Whole Group Quarters Other Reason	0.00	0.00	0.01

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006, 2007, and 2008 American Community Survey.

Note: SEs shown as "0.00" percent are rounded and < 0.005 percent.

Table 2A. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by
Institutional and Noninstitutional Group Quarters Standard Errors (SEs): 2006, 2007, and 2008

Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews	Institutional GQs			Noninstitutional GQs		
	Year and Standard Error (SE)			Year and Standard Error (SE)		
	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE
Response Rate	0.03	0.03	0.10	0.07	0.13	0.19
Reasons for Noninterviews:						
Group Quarters Person Refusal	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.13
Unable to Locate Group Quarters Person	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.09
Resident Temporarily Absent	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.10	0.09
Language Problem	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Insufficient Data	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03
Group Quarters Person Other Reason	0.01	0.03	0.09	0.04	0.04	0.07
Whole Group Quarters Refusal	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.08
Whole Group Quarters Other Reason	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.03

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006, 2007, and 2008 American Community Survey

Note: SEs shown as "0.00 percent" are rounded and < 0.005 percent.

Table 3A. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Major Institutional Group
 Quarters Types Standard Errors (SEs): 2006, 2007, and 2008

Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews	Correctional Facilities for Adults			Juvenile Facilities			Nursing Facilities/Skilled Nursing Facilities			Other Institutional Facilities		
	Year and Standard Error (SE)			Year and Standard Error (SE)			Year and Standard Error (SE)			Year and Standard Error (SE)		
	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE
Response Rates	0.05	0.05	0.20	0.11	0.08	0.28	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.20	0.33	2.14
Reasons for Noninterviews:												
Group Quarters Person Refusal	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.32	0.69
Unable to Locate Group Quarters Person	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.02	0.16
Resident Temporarily Absent	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.12	0.16
Language Problem	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.15	0.12	0.16
Insufficient Data	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.12	0.16
Group Quarters Person Other Reason	0.02	0.05	0.17	0.10	0.06	0.28	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.12	2.06
Whole Group Quarters Refusal	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.17	0.08	0.16
Whole Group Quarters Other Reason	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.12	0.16

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006, 2007, and 2008 American Community Survey

Note: SEs shown as "0.00" percent are rounded and < 0.005 percent.

Table 4A. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews for GQ Persons in Noninstitutional GQ Types Standard Errors (SEs): 2006, 2007, and 2008

Response Rates and Reasons for Noninterviews	College/University Student Housing			Military Quarters			Other Noninstitutional Facilities		
	Year and Standard Error (SE)			Year and Standard Error (SE)			Year and Standard Error (SE)		
	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE	2006 SE	2007 SE	2008 SE
Response Rates	0.09	0.09	0.22	0.24	1.25	0.98	0.10	0.06	0.43
Reasons for Noninterviews:									
Group Quarters Person Refusal	0.06	0.05	0.11	0.03	0.65	0.40	0.06	0.03	0.32
Unable to Locate Group Quarters Person	0.04	0.05	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.68	0.03	0.03	0.01
Resident Temporarily Absent	0.03	0.02	0.11	0.13	1.04	0.61	0.04	0.02	0.02
Language Problem	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01
Insufficient Data	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.17	0.05	0.29	0.01	0.01	0.04
Group Quarters Person Other Reason	0.04	0.05	0.08	0.10	0.28	0.13	0.05	0.04	0.14
Whole Group Quarters Refusal	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.14	0.07	0.03	0.23
Whole Group Quarters Other Reason	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.07

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006, 2007, and 2008 American Community Survey

Note: SEs shown as "0.00" percent are rounded and < 0.005 percent.

APPENDIX B

Table 6A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006			2008		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Race	8,065,644	2.0	0.0	8,246,838	2.9	0.2
Hispanic origin	8,065,644	2.5	0.1	8,246,838	3.7	0.2
Sex	8,065,644	0.2	0.0	8,246,838	0.2	0.0
Age	8,065,644	2.2	0.1	8,246,838	0.7	0.1
Date of Birth	8,065,644	7.3	0.1	8,246,838	3.8	0.2
Citizenship	8,065,644	5.7	0.1	8,246,838	6.3	0.3
Educational attainment	8,055,577	12.9	0.1	8,236,426	14.6	0.3
Marital status	7,988,539	2.8	0.1	8,174,236	7.6	0.3
Veteran Status	7,916,373	10.1	0.1	8,102,586	11.3	0.3
Employment Status Recode	3,908,137	7.2	0.2	4,005,297	17.4	0.6
When last worked	7,959,602	12.1	0.1	8,148,747	16.7	0.4
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	8,065,644	11.7	0.1	8,246,838	12.6	0.3

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 7A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of selected items for the ACS GQ Population: 2006 and 2008 by Institutional/Noninstitutional

Items	INSTITUTIONAL						NONINSTITUTIONAL					
	2006			2008			2006			2008		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Race	4,126,064	1.3	0.1	4,206,880	1.3	0.1	3,939,580	2.9	0.1	4,039,958	4.6	0.3
Hispanic origin	4,126,064	2.1	0.1	4,206,880	2.5	0.2	3,939,580	3.0	0.1	4,039,958	4.9	0.3
Sex	4,126,064	0.2	0.0	4,206,880	0.3	0.0	3,939,580	0.1	0.0	4,039,958	0.2	0.1
Age	4,126,064	2.4	0.1	4,206,880	0.7	0.1	3,939,580	1.9	0.1	4,039,958	0.7	0.1
Date of Birth	4,126,064	7.9	0.2	4,206,880	2.7	0.3	3,939,580	6.7	0.2	4,039,958	5.0	0.4
Citizenship	4,126,064	5.5	0.1	4,206,880	5.2	0.4	3,939,580	5.9	0.1	4,039,958	7.4	0.5
Educational attainment	4,124,072	17.0	0.2	4,205,154	18.6	0.5	3,931,505	8.5	0.1	4,031,272	10.5	0.6
Marital status	4,077,172	3.6	0.1	4,166,492	7.0	0.4	3,911,367	2.0	0.1	4,007,744	8.1	0.5
Veteran Status	4,018,244	12.0	0.1	4,111,606	11.9	0.4	3,898,129	8.2	0.2	3,990,980	10.7	0.6
Employment Status Recode	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,908,137	7.2	0.2	4,005,297	17.4	0.6
When last worked	4,051,465	13.7	0.2	4,143,450	15.9	0.4	3,908,137	10.4	0.2	4,005,297	17.5	0.7
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	4,126,064	12.7	0.1	4,206,880	12.3	0.5	3,939,580	10.6	0.2	4,039,958	12.9	0.6

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 8A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ population by Major Institutional Group Quarters Type: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006			2008		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Adult correctional facilities						
Race	2,050,206	1.6	0.1	2,140,256	1.6	0.2
Hispanic origin	2,050,206	2.2	0.1	2,140,256	2.7	0.2
Sex	2,050,206	0.2	0.0	2,140,256	0.3	0.0
Age	2,050,206	1.6	0.1	2,140,256	0.3	0.1
Date of Birth	2,050,206	5.6	0.2	2,140,256	1.6	0.2
Citizenship	2,050,206	3.5	0.1	2,140,256	3.7	0.4
Educational attainment	2,050,206	11.2	0.2	2,140,256	13.1	0.6
Marital status	2,050,206	5.4	0.1	2,140,256	8.0	0.4
Veteran Status	2,048,945	9.0	0.2	2,138,846	10.3	0.5
When last worked	2,050,206	16.1	0.2	2,140,256	19.1	0.6
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	2,050,206	12.3	0.2	2,140,256	11.6	0.5
Juvenile facilities						
Race	126,601	2.8	0.3	124,031	2.2	1.0
Hispanic origin	126,601	2.3	0.3	124,031	2.9	0.9
Sex	126,601	0.2	0.1	124,031	0.5	0.2
Age	126,601	2.8	0.4	124,031	3.7	1.0
Date of Birth	126,601	13.5	1.2	124,031	12.1	2.2
Citizenship	126,601	7.2	0.5	124,031	4.8	2.0
Educational attainment	125,069	13.0	1.1	122,407	14.3	2.7
Marital status	91,196	0.4	0.2	91,913	7.0	3.0
Veteran Status	42,805	6.3	1.0	41,969	10.4	4.0
When last worked	69,814	13.6	0.9	70,431	17.1	3.4
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	126,601	14.4	0.9	124,031	14.2	3.2
Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities						
Race	1,834,880	0.8	0.1	1,845,567	0.9	0.2
Hispanic origin	1,834,880	1.8	0.1	1,845,567	2.1	0.3
Sex	1,834,880	0.2	0.0	1,845,567	0.2	0.0
Age	1,834,880	3.3	0.1	1,845,567	0.6	0.1
Date of Birth	1,834,880	10.0	0.2	1,845,567	3.0	0.5
Citizenship	1,834,880	7.1	0.2	1,845,567	6.6	0.6
Educational attainment	1,834,880	23.6	0.4	1,845,567	25.4	0.8
Marital status	1,834,880	1.7	0.1	1,845,567	5.8	0.5
Veteran Status	1,834,880	15.0	0.2	1,845,567	13.6	0.7
When last worked	1,834,880	10.6	0.2	1,845,567	11.6	0.6
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	1,834,880	12.4	0.2	1,845,567	12.7	0.7

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 8A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ population by Major Institutional Group Quarters Type: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006			2008		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Other institutional facilities						
Race	114,377	1.2	0.5	97,026	1.3	0.9
Hispanic origin	114,377	4.4	1	97,026	4.5	3.2
Sex	114,377	0.2	0.2	97,026	0.3	0.2
Age	114,377	3.0	0.6	97,026	4.9	2.2
Date of Birth	114,377	10.1	1.1	97,026	9.3	3.4
Citizenship	114,377	11.8	1.5	97,026	10.1	3.4
Educational attainment	113,917	21.2	1.6	96,924	17.4	4.0
Marital status	100,890	4.2	0.8	88,756	8.3	2.1
Veteran Status	91,614	19.4	1.7	85,224	15.0	4.9
When last worked	96,565	20.8	1.9	87,196	29.4	4.2
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	114,377	23.4	1.8	97,026	17.3	4.7

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 9A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Noninstitutional Group Quarters Types: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006			2008		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
College/university housing facilities						
Race	2,269,056	3.6	0.1	2,380,556	6.4	0.5
Hispanic origin	2,269,056	3.5	0.1	2,380,556	6.6	0.5
Sex	2,269,056	0.1	0.0	2,380,556	0.1	0.1
Age	2,269,056	1.7	0.1	2,380,556	0.6	0.2
Date of Birth	2,269,056	4.4	0.2	2,380,556	4.7	0.4
Citizenship	2,269,056	6.1	0.1	2,380,556	8.8	0.6
Educational attainment	2,269,056	4.4	0.2	2,380,556	6.8	0.6
Marital status	2,269,056	2.2	0.1	2,380,556	9.7	0.6
Veteran Status	2,264,952	8.3	0.2	2,375,817	12.3	0.8
Employment Status Recode	2,269,056	9.9	0.2	2,380,556	22.5	0.9
When last worked	2,269,056	11.8	0.2	2,380,556	21.3	0.9
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	2,269,056	9.8	0.2	2,380,556	14.7	0.8
Military Quarters Facilities						
Race	376,092	1.8	0.4	362,305	4.2	1.3
Hispanic origin	376,092	2.2	0.3	362,305	2.4	0.9
Sex	376,092	0.0	0.0	362,305	0.1	0.1
Age	376,092	0.7	0.2	362,305	0.2	0.1
Date of Birth	376,092	4.1	0.6	362,305	3.7	1.5
Citizenship	376,092	4.3	0.4	362,305	4.4	1.0
Educational attainment	376,092	6.5	0.5	362,305	6.8	1.2
Marital status	376,092	0.9	0.2	362,305	3.6	1.3
Veteran Status	376,073	2.6	0.3	362,305	2.2	0.7
Employment Status Recode	376,092	0.5	0.2	362,305	2.7	0.7
When last worked	376,092	2.9	0.2	362,305	5.7	1.0
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	376,092	7.1	0.6	362,305	7.3	1.3

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 9A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Noninstitutional Group Quarters Types: 2006 and 2008

Items	2006			2008		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Other Noninstitutional Facilities						
Race	1,294,432	1.9	0.2	1,297,097	1.5	0.4
Hispanic origin	1,294,432	2.3	0.2	1,297,097	2.5	0.5
Sex	1,294,432	0.2	0.1	1,297,097	0.3	0.1
Age	1,294,432	2.5	0.1	1,297,097	0.9	0.2
Date of Birth	1,294,432	11.5	0.4	1,297,097	5.9	0.9
Citizenship	1,294,432	5.9	0.2	1,297,097	5.7	0.9
Educational attainment	1,286,357	16.2	0.3	1,288,411	18.3	1.4
Marital status	1,266,219	2.1	0.2	1,264,883	6.5	0.8
Veteran Status	1,257,104	9.6	0.3	1,252,858	10.1	1.2
Employment Status Recode	1,262,989	4.4	0.3	1,262,436	12.1	1.2
When last worked	1,262,989	10.1	0.3	1,262,436	13.6	1.3
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	1,294,432	13.0	0.3	1,297,097	11.2	1.2

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 11A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional GQ Types by Who Answered the Questions on the Questionnaire: 2008

Items	Who Answered								
	Sample Person			Proxy			Both		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Institutional									
Race	2,305,182	1.0	0.2	1,539,657	1.5	0.3	123,625	1.1	0.6
Hispanic origin	2,305,182	1.4	0.1	1,539,657	3.6	0.4	123,625	1.1	0.5
Sex	2,305,182	0.2	0.0	1,539,657	0.3	0	123,625	0.3	0.2
Age	2,305,182	0.4	0.1	1,539,657	0.9	0.2	123,625	0.6	0.3
Date of Birth	2,305,182	1.5	0.1	1,539,657	4.4	0.7	123,625	2.8	1.2
Citizenship	2,305,182	0.9	0.1	1,539,657	10.9	0.9	123,625	2.5	0.8
Educational attainment	2,304,963	3.8	0.4	1,538,377	40.9	1	123,625	11.5	1.6
Marital status	2,293,311	1.4	0.2	1,515,735	14.6	0.8	120,790	4.7	1.5
Veteran Status	2,265,425	2.4	0.3	1,490,994	24.9	0.9	120,055	7.3	1.7
When last worked	2,281,789	4.2	0.3	1,505,147	30.2	0.9	120,609	8.4	1.6
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	2,305,182	3.0	0.3	1,539,657	25.2	0.9	123,625	9.0	2
Adult correctional facilities									
Race	1,581,399	1.1	0.2	375,361	2.0	0.4	8,342	3.7	3.2
Hispanic origin	1,581,399	1.5	0.2	375,361	5.9	0.6	8,342	3.9	3.8
Sex	1,581,399	0.2	0.0	375,361	0.5	0.1	8,342	0.4	0.7
Age	1,581,399	0.2	0.1	375,361	0.4	0.2	8,342	0.0	0.0
Date of Birth	1,581,399	1.0	0.1	375,361	3.1	0.6	8,342	3.0	2.1
Citizenship	1,581,399	0.7	0.1	375,361	14.4	1.7	8,342	11.7	4.2
Educational attainment	1,581,399	2.4	0.2	375,361	55.8	2	8,342	27.9	9.1
Marital status	1,581,399	1.2	0.2	375,361	33.7	1.5	8,342	21.9	6.8
Veteran Status	1,580,281	2.1	0.3	375,069	39.3	2	8,342	37.0	8.5
When last worked	1,581,399	4.2	0.3	375,361	68.4	2	8,342	42.9	7.9
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	1,581,399	2.1	0.3	375,361	48.1	1.7	8,342	28.9	7.2
Juvenile facilities									
Race	58,925	2.6	2.3	57,503	1.3	0.6	3,419	9.1	10.8
Hispanic origin	58,925	1.5	0.7	57,503	2.8	1.0	3,419	13.4	9.3
Sex	58,925	0.3	0.2	57,503	0.7	0.4	3,419	1.0	1.8
Age	58,925	4.2	1.4	57,503	3.2	1.1	3,419	0.9	1.9
Date of Birth	58,925	6.3	1.8	57,503	16.2	3.5	3,419	35.6	28.1
Citizenship	58,925	0.2	0.1	57,503	7.0	2.7	3,419	11.9	18.5
Educational attainment	58,706	6.2	1.5	56,325	22.1	4.7	3,419	17.4	18.1
Marital status	48,389	0.7	0.5	39,369	15.1	6.3	1,672	6.0	9.1
Veteran Status	22,764	1.4	0.9	17,282	20.7	8.7	964	23.9	31.5
When last worked	37,500	4.5	1.5	29,708	31.2	6.6	1,491	30.6	35.1
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	58,925	4.1	1.3	57,503	24.2	5.6	3,419	23.2	19.7

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 11A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional GQ Types by Who Answered the Questions on the Questionnaire: 2008

Items	Who Answered								
	Sample Person			Proxy			Both		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities									
Race	621482	0.4	0.1	1062281	1.2	0.3	108020	0.7	0.4
Hispanic origin	621,482	0.9	0.2	1,062,281	2.8	0.5	108,020	0.6	0.2
Sex	621,482	0.3	0.1	1,062,281	0.2	0	108,020	0.3	0.2
Age	621,482	0.5	0.1	1,062,281	0.7	0.2	108,020	0.5	0.3
Date of Birth	621,482	2.1	0.3	1,062,281	3.7	0.9	108,020	1.7	0.6
Citizenship	621,482	1.5	0.4	1,062,281	9.7	1.0	108,020	1.5	0.6
Educational attainment	621,482	7.1	1.0	1,062,281	37.0	1.3	108,020	10.2	1.7
Marital status	621,482	1.8	0.4	1,062,281	8.0	0.8	108,020	3.3	1.4
Veteran Status	621,482	3.0	0.5	1,062,281	19.9	1.1	108,020	4.8	1.5
When last worked	621,482	3.3	0.6	1,062,281	16.3	0.9	108,020	5.3	1.4
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	621,482	5.0	0.6	1,062,281	17.1	1	108,020	6.0	1.4
Other institutional facilities									
Race	43,376	0.2	0.2	44,512	1.5	1.1	3,844	0.0	0.0
Hispanic origin	43,376	1.5	0.8	44,512	4.1	2.2	3,844	0.0	0.0
Sex	43,376	0.0	0.0	44,512	0.6	0.4	3,844	0.0	0.0
Age	43,376	2.2	1.6	44,512	8.2	4.5	3,844	4.6	5.5
Date of Birth	43,376	2.8	1.7	44,512	16.9	6.9	3,844	4.6	5.5
Citizenship	43,376	3.7	0.6	44,512	17.6	6.7	3,844	2.1	3.4
Educational attainment	43,376	3.9	1.4	44,410	32.1	7.6	3,844	7.4	11.4
Marital status	42,041	5.4	1.4	38,724	12.5	4.3	2,756	7.3	13.8
Veteran Status	40,898	2.6	1.4	36,362	24.7	6.6	2,729	11.4	17.7
When last worked	41,408	18.0	2.1	37,797	40.3	8.0	2,756	15.6	11.3
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	43,376	3.2	1.7	44,512	26.1	6.8	3,844	38.0	31

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 12A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population By Who Answered the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Who Answered								
	Sample Person			Proxy			Both		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Noninstitutional									
Race	2,808,316	0.9	0.1	1,033,341	13.8	1.1	69,100	1.6	0.8
Hispanic origin	2,808,316	1.0	0.2	1,033,341	14.5	1.2	69,100	2.6	1.1
Sex	2,808,316	0.1	0.0	1,033,341	0.3	0.1	69,100	0.5	0.3
Age	2,808,316	0.4	0.1	1,033,341	1.3	0.4	69,100	0.7	0.5
Date of Birth	2,808,316	2.6	0.3	1,033,341	11.1	1.1	69,100	8.1	2.6
Citizenship	2,808,316	1.0	0.2	1,033,341	23.4	1.5	69,100	6.3	2.5
Educational attainment	2,807,453	1.9	0.3	1,025,946	32.2	1.9	69,025	14.8	3.5
Marital status	2,804,256	1.4	0.2	1,008,961	25.2	1.5	68,112	11.5	3.3
Veteran Status	2,797,073	1.9	0.3	1,000,336	33.4	1.8	67,568	11.7	3.0
Employment Status Recode	2,803,926	7.4	0.4	1,007,017	43.4	1.6	67,987	21.0	3.4
When last worked	2,803,926	4.3	0.3	1,007,017	51.6	1.8	67,987	20.7	3.5
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	2,808,316	2.6	0.3	1,033,341	39.2	1.6	69,100	12.3	3.5
College/university student housing									
Race	1,859,156	0.8	0.1	444,309	27.5	2.3	21,040	3.5	2.1
Hispanic origin	1,859,156	0.8	0.2	444,309	28.6	2.4	21,040	4.1	2.2
Sex	1,859,156	0.1	0.0	444,309	0.3	0.2	21,040	0.9	0.9
Age	1,859,156	0.4	0.1	444,309	1.2	0.6	21,040	0.8	0.8
Date of Birth	1,859,156	2.2	0.3	444,309	13.4	1.7	21,040	16.8	6.2
Citizenship	1,859,156	1.0	0.3	444,309	38.8	2.5	21,040	14.4	7.3
Educational attainment	1,859,156	1.2	0.2	444,309	27.2	2.7	21,040	14.5	6.9
Marital status	1,859,156	1.3	0.3	444,309	41.7	2.6	21,040	23.2	7.6
Veteran Status	1,857,046	1.7	0.3	441,901	53.0	3.0	20,971	26.2	8.1
Employment Status Recode	1,859,156	8.1	0.5	444,309	78.4	2.4	21,040	42.7	7.4
When last worked	1,859,156	3.9	0.4	444,309	89.0	2.0	21,040	44.7	8.3
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	1,859,156	2.3	0.4	444,309	63.4	2.5	21,040	23.1	9.5

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 12A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population By Who Answered the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Sample Person			Who Answered Proxy			Both		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Military quarters facilities									
Race	305,055	0.9	0.5	49,243	21.5	7.4	1,867	7.0	13.9
Hispanic origin	305,055	0.5	0.3	49,243	11.6	5.4	1,867	2.6	4.0
Sex	305,055	0.1	0.1	49,243	0.2	0.3	1,867	0.0	0.0
Age	305,055	0.2	0.1	49,243	0.5	0.4	1,867	0.0	0.0
Date of Birth	305,055	2.6	1.8	49,243	10.1	3.1	1,867	3.9	7.7
Citizenship	305,055	0.4	0.3	49,243	26.3	5.0	1,867	8.6	18.8
Educational attainment	305,055	1.1	1.1	49,243	38.5	6.3	1,867	13.6	24.4
Marital status	305,055	0.7	0.7	49,243	15.2	6.2	1,867	4.4	10.7
Veteran Status	305,055	0.7	0.4	49,243	8.4	3.3	1,867	4.4	10.7
Employment Status Recode	305,055	1.8	0.4	49,243	4.9	2.4	1,867	5.7	5.5
When last worked	305,055	3.2	0.6	49,243	17.6	4.7	1,867	10.1	9.3
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	305,055	0.8	0.3	49,243	40.5	6.6	1,867	15.1	26.5
Other noninstitutional facilities									
Race	644,105	1.1	0.3	539,789	1.8	0.9	46,193	0.5	0.4
Hispanic origin	644,105	2.0	0.5	539,789	3.2	1.1	46,193	2.0	1.5
Sex	644,105	0.3	0.2	539,789	0.3	0.2	46,193	0.3	0.4
Age	644,105	0.4	0.1	539,789	1.5	0.5	46,193	0.7	0.6
Date of Birth	644,105	3.5	0.7	539,789	9.2	1.8	46,193	4.4	2.5
Citizenship	644,105	1.4	0.5	539,789	10.4	2.0	46,193	2.5	1.0
Educational attainment	643,242	4.5	0.7	532,394	35.8	2.6	46,118	15.0	4.4
Marital status	640,045	1.9	0.4	515,409	12.0	1.7	45,205	6.3	3.8
Veteran Status	634,972	3.0	0.7	509,192	18.8	2.3	44,730	5.2	3.6
Employment Status Recode	639,715	8.0	1.1	513,465	16.8	2.0	45,080	11.4	3.4
When last worked	639,715	6.1	1.0	513,465	22.5	2.4	45,080	9.9	4.6
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	644,105	4.1	0.9	539,789	19.2	2.4	46,193	7.2	3.6

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent

Appendix 13A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of selected items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology used to collect the data in 2008: Institutional

Questionnaires completed by												
Items	Personal			Telephone			Self response			Combination		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Institutional												
Race	3,551,652	0.9	0.2	48,605	2.9	1.5	20,9198	2.8	0.5	13,0957	3.0	1.3
Hispanic origin	3,551,652	1.9	0.2	48,605	6.6	2.9	20,9198	5.0	0.6	13,0957	6.1	1.6
Sex	3,551,652	0.2	0.0	48,605	0.3	0.2	20,9198	0.1	0.1	13,0957	0.2	0.1
Age	3,551,652	0.6	0.1	48,605	1.0	0.8	20,9198	1.5	0.7	13,0957	0.8	0.9
Date of Birth	3,551,652	2.2	0.2	48,605	17.2	7.4	20,9198	3.8	0.9	13,0957	7.9	2.1
Citizenship	3,551,652	4.4	0.3	48,605	23.8	7.7	20,9198	2.2	0.7	13,0957	16.5	2.8
Educational attainment	3,550,009	18.0	0.5	48,605	50.4	6.8	20,9142	7.1	1.1	13,0957	34.2	3.8
Marital status	3,519,183	6.0	0.4	46,781	27.5	5.8	20,5887	4.3	1.0	12,8850	19.7	3.1
Veteran Status	3,475,055	10.0	0.4	44,948	46.1	6.7	20,0716	9.3	1.5	12,7246	31.4	3.8
When last worked	3,500,318	12.9	0.5	45,947	47.8	6.5	20,3999	17.3	1.8	12,8402	33.0	3.5
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	3,551,652	11.0	0.4	48,605	42.1	7.5	20,9198	7.5	1.9	13,0957	27.0	3.6
Adult correctional facilities												
Race	1,731,528	1.0	0.2	19,783	3.2	2.4	163,657	3.2	0.5	42,489	4.7	1.7
Hispanic origin	1,731,528	1.8	0.2	19,783	4.6	3.8	163,657	5.8	0.8	42,489	12.5	2.4
Sex	1,731,528	0.3	0.1	19,783	0.2	0.3	163,657	0.1	0.1	42,489	0.4	0.3
Age	1,731,528	0.2	0.1	19,783	0.0	0.0	163,657	0.4	0.2	42,489	0.4	0.4
Date of Birth	1,731,528	1.1	0.2	19,783	6.8	3.8	163,657	1.7	0.4	42,489	10.9	1.6
Citizenship	1,731,528	2.6	0.3	19,783	18.4	6.8	163,657	1.7	0.7	42,489	27.5	4.3
Educational attainment	1,731,528	12.0	0.6	19,783	53.6	9.8	163,657	4.6	0.8	42,489	46.4	5.2
Marital status	1,731,,28	6.7	0.4	19,783	47.8	8.7	163,657	3.4	0.7	42,489	39.1	5.4
Veteran Status	1,730,387	7.8	0.5	19,737	51.2	9.0	163,592	8.1	1.7	42,441	51.1	6
When last worked	1,731,528	14.7	0.6	19,783	64.1	7.5	163,657	17.9	1.8	42,489	55.2	5.2
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	1,731,528	10.0	0.5	19,783	48.2	10.1	163,657	7.3	2.3	42,489	41.6	5.5

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 13A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of selected items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology used to collect the data in 2008: Institutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by											
	Personal			Telephone			Self response			Combination		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Juveniles facilities												
Race	98,522	1.9	1.3	5,390	6.7	5.3	12,075	1.4	1.7	4,274	7.3	9.3
Hispanic origin	98,522	2.0	0.8	5,390	14.2	9.5	12,075	2.2	1.9	4,274	12.2	11.0
Sex	98,522	0.5	0.3	5,390	1.1	1.2	12,075	0.0	0.0	4,274	0.8	1.4
Age	98,522	3.2	0.8	5,390	6.8	6.3	12,075	5.6	5.2	4,274	1.9	2.5
Date of Birth	98,522	8.6	2.0	5,390	33.5	15.2	12,075	18.3	9.7	4,274	37.9	27.1
Citizenship	98,522	4.2	2.3	5,390	19.9	12.2	12,075	0.0	0.0	4,274	15.0	15.3
Educational attainment	96,981	11.8	2.7	5,390	47.3	20.2	12,019	13.9	6.8	4,274	26.5	19.4
Marital status	72,329	4.8	2.4	3,699	22.1	16.1	10,071	12.8	7.5	2,662	23.5	17.5
Veteran Status	32,567	6.7	3.5	1,912	33.9	19.1	5,202	16.0	8.1	1,176	48.4	26.2
When last worked	54,919	12.4	3.0	2,865	42.2	21.3	8,288	24.7	11.7	2,214	51.8	23.8
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	98,522	12.8	3.5	5,390	33.4	16.2	12,075	10.0	6.1	4,274	25.6	20.6
Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities												
Race	1,641,925	0.8	0.3	21,711	0.8	0.8	26,645	1.3	0.9	82,138	1.8	1.9
Hispanic origin	1,641,925	1.9	0.4	21,711	5.9	5.1	26,645	1.6	0.9	82,138	2.4	1.9
Sex	1,641,925	0.2	0.0	21,711	0.1	0.2	26,645	0.3	0.3	82,138	0.1	0.1
Age	1,641,925	0.6	0.1	21,711	0.6	0.9	26,645	4.4	4.4	82,138	0.2	0.1
Date of Birth	1,641,925	2.6	0.4	21,711	23.0	14.2	26,645	7.4	4.4	82,138	4.1	2.4
Citizenship	1,641,925	5.9	0.5	21,711	31.6	13.7	26,645	4.6	3.0	82,138	10.9	3.5
Educational attainment	1,641,925	24.7	0.9	21,711	50.7	10.3	26,645	16.0	4.8	82,138	28.1	5.5
Marital status	1,641,925	5.2	0.5	21,711	10.8	5.2	26,645	6.5	4.0	82,138	9.7	3.1
Veteran Status	1,641,925	12.4	0.7	21,711	44.7	10.6	26,645	15.6	4.8	82,138	20.7	5.0
When last worked	1,641,925	10.3	0.7	21,711	36.3	12.8	26,645	12.2	5.0	82,138	20.7	4.9
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	1,641,925	11.8	0.6	21,711	40.9	12.9	26,645	8.2	2.9	82,138	19.2	5.0

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 13A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of selected items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology used to collect the data in 2008: Institutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by											
	Personal			Telephone			Self response			Combination		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Other institutional facilities												
Race	79,677	0.6	0.5	1,721	13.4	23.4	6,821	0.1	0.1	2,056	3.4	4.0
Hispanic origin	79,677	2.1	0.9	1,721	13.4	23.4	6,821	3.9	2.7	2,056	10.5	9.0
Sex	79,677	0.4	0.2	1,721	0.0	0.0	6,821	0.0	0	2,056	0.0	0.0
Age	79,677	4.2	2.4	1,721	0.0	0.0	6,821	10.8	11	2,056	34.3	40.0
Date of Birth	79,677	8.9	3.7	1,721	13.4	23.4	6,821	14.0	10.9	2,056	34.3	40.0
Citizenship	79,677	10.9	3.8	1,721	0.0	0.0	6,821	9.0	7	2,056	17.3	20.1
Educational attainment	79,575	17.1	4.4	1,721	19.5	22.3	6,821	19.5	9.9	2,056	45.1	33.6
Marital status	73,401	9.1	2.3	1,588	14.6	25.1	5,514	6.3	5.4	1,561	8.9	8.5
Veteran Status	70,176	12.0	3.5	1,588	17.6	24.8	5,277	7.2	3.9	1,491	49.6	27.5
When last worked	71,946	28.9	4.3	1,588	11.3	19.5	5,409	13.9	3.5	1,561	50.6	26.2
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	79,677	14.1	3.7	1,721	13.4	23.4	6,821	6.6	4.7	2,056	37.9	31.9

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 14A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology used to collect the data in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by											
	Personal			Telephone			Self response			Combination		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Noninstitutional												
Race	2,000,910	5.0	0.6	543,268	5.0	0.9	1,154,870	1.2	0.3	171,619	11.6	2.0
Hispanic origin	2,000,910	5.6	0.6	543,268	5.6	0.9	1,154,870	1.2	0.3	171,619	9.8	2.0
Sex	2,000,910	0.2	0.1	543,268	0.2	0.1	1,154,870	0.1	0.1	171,619	0.1	0.1
Age	2,000,910	0.8	0.2	543,268	0.6	0.2	1,154,870	0.3	0.1	171,619	0.6	0.3
Date of Birth	2,000,910	5.7	0.6	543,268	6.1	0.8	1,154,870	1.6	0.3	171,619	10.5	2.0
Citizenship	2,000,910	9.0	0.8	543,268	9.3	1.1	1,154,870	0.5	0.1	171,619	17.2	3.0
Educational attainment	1,995,081	14.3	1.0	542,436	9.8	1.4	1,153,749	1.6	0.3	171,145	17.0	3.0
Marital status	1,979,082	9.7	0.7	540,945	9.4	1.3	1,151,456	1.5	0.3	170,235	17.5	3.2
Veteran Status	1,966,426	12.6	0.9	540,595	13.6	1.6	1,149,191	1.9	0.4	169,154	24.0	3.8
Employment Status Recode	1,977,267	20.1	0.8	540,815	21.9	1.7	1,151,199	5.9	0.5	170,038	35.0	3.7
When last worked	1,977,267	20.7	1.0	540,815	20.9	1.7	1,151,199	4.3	0.5	170,038	41.2	3.8
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	2,000,910	15.8	0.9	543,268	15.0	1.7	1,154,,870	2.2	0.3	171,619	29.5	3.9
College/university student housing												
Race	911,672	9.1	1.1	458,523	5.3	0.9	840,980	1.0	0.2	88,799	17.7	2.9
Hispanic origin	911,672	9.5	1.1	458,523	6.1	1.0	840,980	0.9	0.2	88,799	16.4	3.1
Sex	911,672	0.2	0.1	458,523	0.2	0.1	840,980	0.1	0.1	88,799	0.2	0.2
Age	911,672	0.8	0.4	458,523	0.5	0.3	840,980	0.3	0.1	88,799	0.5	0.3
Date of Birth	911,672	5.4	0.8	458,523	5.5	0.9	840,980	1.2	0.2	88,799	15.3	3.0
Citizenship	911,672	12.9	1.2	458,523	8.9	1.2	840,980	0.4	0.1	88,799	25.9	4.6
Educational attainment	911,672	9.3	1.2	458,523	6.4	1.2	840,980	1.1	0.3	88,799	16.1	4.6
Marital status	911,672	13.8	1.2	458,523	9.7	1.4	840,980	1.1	0.2	88,799	27.8	5.5
Veteran Status	908,549	17.1	1.5	458,303	13.2	1.6	840,319	1.5	0.3	88,216	37.9	6.4
Employment Status Recode	911,672	31.1	1.5	458,523	23.4	1.7	840,980	6.3	0.4	88,799	57.6	5.1
When last worked	911,672	31.0	1.5	458,523	21.1	1.7	840,980	3.3	0.4	88,799	64.8	5.0
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	911,672	21.8	1.3	458,523	14.3	1.7	840,980	1.9	0.3	88,799	41.4	6.1

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent

Table 14A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology used to collect the data in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Questionnaires completed by											
	Personal			Telephone			Self response			Combination		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
No institutional												
Race	151,522	4.4	2	30,936	3.7	3.3	142,280	2.1	1.8	29,869	9.0	5.5
Hispanic origin	151,522	3.9	1.8	30,936	1.3	1	142,280	0.6	0.6	29,869	0.9	1.0
Sex	151,522	0.1	0.1	30,936	0.5	0.7	142,280	0.0	0	29,869	0.0	0.0
Age	151,522	0.2	0.3	30,936	0.0	0	142,280	0.2	0.2	29,869	0.3	0.4
Date of Birth	151,522	5.6	3	30,936	8.1	4.6	142,280	1.2	0.5	29,869	1.8	1.1
Citizenship	151,522	4.5	1.3	30,936	9.9	4.5	142,280	0.6	0.6	29,869	11.9	6.1
Educational attainment	151,522	7.7	2.2	30,936	9.1	3.9	142,280	0.5	0.4	29,869	24.6	7.6
Marital status	151,522	4.4	2.7	30,936	2.4	2.5	142,280	0.9	0.9	29,869	3.8	2.3
Veteran Status	151,522	2.5	1.2	30,936	1.6	1.3	142,280	0.6	0.4	29,869	4.3	2.4
Employment Status Recode	151,522	2.3	0.9	30,936	4.3	2.2	142,280	1.5	0.6	29,869	3.1	1.4
When last worked	151,522	5.2	1.4	30,936	7.2	3.3	142,280	3.2	0.8	29,869	12.3	4.4
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	151,522	7.1	1.9	30,936	11.7	4	142,280	0.9	0.5	29,869	24.3	7.6
Other noninstitutional facilities												
Race	937,716	1.1	0.5	53,809	2.7	2.4	171,610	1.7	0.6	52,951	2.8	2.2
Hispanic origin	937,716	2.1	0.5	53,809	3.5	2.7	171,610	3.3	1.2	52,951	3.6	2.1
Sex	937,716	0.3	0.1	53,809	0.5	0.4	171,610	0.0	0.1	52,951	0.0	0.0
Age	937,716	0.9	0.3	53,809	1.5	1.0	171,610	0.6	0.4	52,951	1.1	0.8
Date of Birth	937,716	6.0	1.0	53,809	9.9	4.4	171,610	3.9	1.4	52,951	7.2	3.6
Citizenship	937,716	6.0	1.3	53,809	12.9	4.9	171,610	0.7	0.3	52,951	5.5	3.2
Educational attainment	931,887	20.2	1.7	52,977	39.6	7.2	170,489	4.5	1.3	52,477	14.3	4.4
Marital status	915,888	6.4	1.0	51,486	11.1	4.3	168,196	4.2	1.6	51,567	7.8	3.3
Veteran Status	906,355	9.8	1.4	51,356	24.0	7.5	166,592	5.2	2.0	51,069	11.5	4.7
Employment Status Recode	914,073	12.2	1.4	51,356	19.7	6.3	167,939	7.8	1.8	51,370	14.5	4.0
When last worked	914,073	12.9	1.5	51,356	27.3	7.6	167,939	10.4	2.4	51,370	17.4	6.0
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	937,716	11.3	1.5	53,809	22.8*	7.7	171,610	4.9	1.5	52,951	12.5	4.7

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent

Table 15A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) questionnaire in 2008: Institutional

Items	Administrative Records Used								
	No			Some			All		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Institutional									
Race	2,113,448	0.9	0.2	386,408	0.7	0.2	1,488,511	1.7	0.3
Hispanic origin	2,113,448	1.3	0.1	386,408	1.4	0.4	1,488,511	4.0	0.5
Sex	2,113,448	0.2	0.0	386,408	0.2	0.1	1,488,511	0.3	0.1
Age	2,113,448	0.4	0.1	386,408	1.0	0.5	1,488,511	0.8	0.2
Date of Birth	2,113,448	1.5	0.2	386,408	3.9	1.1	1,488,511	3.9	0.6
Citizenship	2,113,448	0.5	0.1	386,408	4.4	1.0	1,488,511	12.1	0.9
Educational attainment	2,113,032	2.3	0.2	386,408	23.4	1.9	1,487,254	41.6	1.1
Marital status	2,101,858	1.0	0.1	380,393	5.5	1.0	1,467,136	15.9	0.9
Veteran Status	2,076,421	1.7	0.2	374,325	10.7	1.7	1,446,057	26.7	1.0
When last worked	2,091,160	3.1	0.3	377,979	10.4	1.3	1,458,033	34.6	0.9
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	2,113,448	2.2	0.3	386,408	10.6	1.4	1,488,511	27.1	1.0
Adult correctional facilities									
Race	1,523,473	1.0	0.2	31,511	1.4	0.8	419,246	2.1	0.4
Hispanic origin	1,523,473	1.4	0.2	31,511	3.4	1.5	419,246	5.5	0.6
Sex	1,523,473	0.2	0.0	31,511	0.2	0.3	419,246	0.5	0.1
Age	1,523,473	0.2	0.1	31,511	0.3	0.3	419,246	0.4	0.1
Date of Birth	1,523,473	1.0	0.1	31,511	2.6	1.7	419,246	2.8	0.5
Citizenship	1,523,473	0.5	0.1	31,511	12.2	3.9	419,246	14.5	1.6
Educational attainment	1,523,473	1.8	0.2	31,511	51.2	4.9	419,246	52.3	1.9
Marital status	1,523,473	0.8	0.1	31,511	26.3	6.5	419,246	32.4	1.4
Veteran Status	1,522,467	1.6	0.3	31,511	30.8	5.5	418,897	39.0	1.9
When last worked	1,523,473	3.2	0.3	31,511	47.9	6.9	419,246	71.5	1.6
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	1,523,473	1.5	0.3	31,511	33.2	6.6	419,246	46.8	1.6
Juvenile facilities									
Race	54,882	2.7	2.4	14,135	2.2	3.3	50,882	1.7	0.7
Hispanic origin	54,882	0.9	0.3	14,135	4.4	4.3	50,882	4.8	1.8
Sex	54,882	0.3	0.2	14,135	0.0	0	50,882	0.8	0.5
Age	54,882	4.0	1.1	14,135	2.3	1.3	50,882	3.0	1.2
Date of Birth	54,882	6.3	1.6	14,135	18.9	13.6	50,882	16.0	4.4
Citizenship	54,882	0.2	0.2	14,135	0.8	0.6	50,882	10.9	4.7
Educational attainment	54,466	6.1	1.4	14,135	7.3	4.1	49,727	25.6	5.4
Marital status	45,346	0.7	0.5	9,571	2.5	2.3	33,564	17.0	7.2
Veteran Status	21,979	0.7	0.5	3,672	3.5	2.9	15,003	25.4	9.8
When last worked	35,281	4.4	1.5	7,157	8.9	6.7	25,388	36.5	7.3
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	54,882	3.7	1.3	14,135	7.9	3.6	50,882	27.6	6.6

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 15A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) questionnaire in 2008: Institutional

Items	Administrative Records Used								
	No			Some			All		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Nursing facilities/skilled nursing facilities									
Race	504,678	0.3	0.1	333,634	0.5	0.2	963,107	1.5	0.4
Hispanic origin	504,678	0.7	0.2	333,634	0.9	0.4	963,107	3.2	0.6
Sex	504,678	0.3	0.1	333,634	0.2	0.1	963,107	0.2	0.0
Age	504,678	0.6	0.2	333,634	0.8	0.5	963,107	0.6	0.2
Date of Birth	504,678	2.5	0.4	333,634	3.2	1.1	963,107	3.2	0.8
Citizenship	504,678	0.6	0.1	333,634	3.7	1.1	963,107	10.9	1.0
Educational attainment	504,678	3.0	0.4	333,634	21.4	2.2	963,107	38.8	1.4
Marital status	504,678	1.4	0.4	333,634	3.3	0.8	963,107	9.0	0.9
Veteran Status	504,678	1.9	0.5	333,634	8.6	1.7	963,107	21.6	1.2
When last worked	504,678	2.7	0.6	333,634	6.7	1.2	963,107	18.0	1.0
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	504,678	4.1	0.5	333,634	8.4	1.3	963,107	18.8	1.1
Other institutional facilities									
Race	30,415	0.7	0.7	7,128	3.2	5.3	55,276	1.4	1.2
Hispanic origin	30,415	2.0	1.1	7,128	9.4	10.1	55,276	5.1	4.7
Sex	30,415	0.0	0.0	7,128	0.0	0.0	55,276	0.5	0.3
Age	30,415	2.9	2.1	7,128	11.5	10.7	55,276	5.3	3.6
Date of Birth	30,415	3.6	2.1	7,128	14.7	12.0	55,276	11.9	5.4
Citizenship	30,415	1.2	0.7	7,128	10.9	9.8	55,276	15.4	4.9
Educational attainment	30,415	4.5	1.8	7,128	28.9	15.0	55,174	23.6	6.1
Marital status	28,361	3.4	1.8	5,677	23.4	15.3	51,219	9.9	3.2
Veteran Status	27,297	2.9	1.7	5,508	30.3	15.8	49,050	20.3	7.1
When last worked	27,728	4.1	1.7	5,677	23.0	12.7	50,292	45.0	6.2
Person Food Stamp Reciprocity	30,415	3.9	2.4	7,128	19.2	13.4	55,276	22.9	6.9

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 16A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Administrative Records Used								
	No			Some			All		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Noninstitutional									
Race	2,629,824	0.8	0.1	296,115	6.2	1.7	896,259	15.5	1.3
Hispanic origin	2,629,824	0.9	0.1	296,115	6.6	1.7	896,259	16.6	1.4
Sex	2,629,824	0.1	0.1	296,115	0.3	0.2	896,259	0.3	0.1
Age	2,629,824	0.5	0.1	296,115	0.6	0.5	896,259	1.0	0.4
Date of Birth	2,629,824	3.0	0.3	296,115	8.6	1.4	896,259	9.7	1.2
Citizenship	2,629,824	0.7	0.1	296,115	9.8	1.7	896,259	27.1	1.7
Educational attainment	2,624,959	1.7	0.3	295,219	20.0	2.5	893,646	34.0	1.8
Marital status	2,614,107	1.1	0.2	292,863	10.5	2	885,551	29.0	1.7
Veteran status	2,606,216	1.6	0.2	289,652	13.6	2.1	880,491	37.8	2.0
Employment Status Recode	2,613,284	7.2	0.4	292,116	26.3	2.8	884,868	46.1	1.9
When last worked	2,613,284	4.0	0.3	292,116	28.3	2.6	884,868	55.4	2.0
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	2,629,824	2.1	0.2	296,115	18.3	2.3	896,259	44.6	1.8
College/university student housing									
Race	1,747,932	0.7	0.1	100,749	12.2	3.1	410,242	30.2	2.5
Hispanic origin	1,747,932	0.7	0.2	100,749	12.3	3.4	410,242	31.5	2.6
Sex	1,747,932	0.1	0.0	100,749	0.2	0.2	410,242	0.3	0.3
Age	1,747,932	0.5	0.1	100,749	1.0	1.2	410,242	0.9	0.6
Date of Birth	1,747,932	2.6	0.4	100,749	14.1	3.6	410,242	11.7	1.6
Citizenship	1,747,932	0.7	0.2	100,749	20.9	4.1	410,242	42.3	2.6
Educational attainment	1,747,932	1.2	0.2	100,749	15.8	3.7	410,242	29.2	2.7
Marital status	1,747,932	0.9	0.2	100,749	20.5	4.1	410,242	46.5	2.6
Veteran Status	1,745,859	1.3	0.2	100,680	28.0	4.3	407,797	57.7	3.1
Employment Status Recode	1,747,932	7.8	0.5	100,749	56.5	4.6	410,242	79.6	2.6
When last worked	1,747,932	3.5	0.3	100,749	63.5	5	410,242	90.1	2.2
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	1,747,932	1.8	0.3	100,749	35.0	4.8	410,242	67.5	2.6
Military quarters facilities									
Race	291,316	0.9	0.5	16,334	9.0	6.2	44,414	23.0	8.4
Hispanic origin	291,316	0.6	0.3	16,334	7.4	5.6	44,414	12.3	6.8
Sex	291,316	0.1	0.1	16,334	0.0	0.0	44,414	0.2	0.3
Age	291,316	0.2	0.1	16,334	0.2	0.4	44,414	0.6	0.6
Date of Birth	291,316	2.9	1.8	16,334	6.5	3.2	44,414	7.7	3.0
Citizenship	291,316	0.5	0.3	16,334	12.1	6.5	44,414	26.4	6.0
Educational attainment	291,316	1.3	1.1	16,334	21.0	9.1	44,414	37.7	7.0
Marital status	291,316	0.8	0.7	16,334	2.5	2.2	44,414	22.5	6.7
Veteran Status	291,316	0.7	0.4	16,334	2.4	2.8	44,414	11.6	4.5
Employment Status Recode	291,316	1.8	0.5	16,334	3.2	2.0	44,414	8.1	4.0
When last worked	291,316	3.1	0.6	16,334	6.8	3.2	44,414	22.2	5.9
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	291,316	1.0	0.3	16,334	22.8	9.5	44,414	43.3	6.8

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

Table 16A. (Cont.) Margins of Error (MOE) for the Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional

Items	Administrative Records Used								
	No			Some			All		
	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE	Universe (count)	% Alloc	MOE
Other noninstitutional facilities									
Race	590,576	1.1	0.3	179,032	2.6	2.3	441,603	1.2	0.4
Hispanic origin	590,576	1.7	0.4	179,032	3.3	2.3	441,603	3.3	0.8
Sex	590,576	0.3	0.2	179,032	0.4	0.3	441,603	0.2	0.2
Age	590,576	0.9	0.3	179,032	0.4	0.2	441,603	1.1	0.5
Date of Birth	590,576	4.4	0.7	179,032	5.8	1.9	441,603	8.1	2.0
Citizenship	590,576	1.1	0.4	179,032	3.3	1.1	441,603	13.0	2.4
Educational attainment	585,711	3.4	0.6	178,136	22.3	3.6	438,990	38.0	2.7
Marital status	574,859	2.0	0.5	175,780	5.5	1.6	430,895	13.1	1.9
Veteran Status	569,041	2.9	0.7	172,638	6.4	1.8	428,280	21.6	2.7
Employment Status Recode	574,036	8.1	1.0	175,033	11.1	2.2	430,212	18.2	2.5
When last worked	574,036	5.9	1.0	175,033	10.0	2.3	430,212	25.7	2.8
Person Food Stamp Recipiency	590,576	3.5	0.6	179,032	8.5	1.8	441,603	23.4	2.7

Note: Percent shown as 0.0 are rounded and < than 0.05 percent.

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. ACS-1(GQ) 2008 Questionnaire Instrument – Census Use Only Page	16

LIST OF TABLES

Table A. Number of GQs in Sample: 2006, 2007, and 2008	2
Table B. Distribution of Sample by Major GQ Type	3
Table C. Who Answered the GQ Questionnaire: 2006, 2007, 2008	4
Table 1. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons For Noninterviews: 2006, 2007, and 2008	8
Table 2. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Institutional and Noninstitutional Group Quarters: 2006, 2007, and 2008	9
Table 3. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Major Institutional Group Quarters Types: 2006, 2007, and 2008	10
Table 4. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Major Noninstitutional GQ Types: 2006, 2007, and 2008	11
Table 5. Items Analyzed	15
Table 6. Allocation Rates for Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population: 2006 and 2008	17
Table 7. Allocation Rates for Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population: 2006 and 2008 by Institutional/Noninstitutional	18
Table 8. Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional Group Quarters Type: 2006 and 2008	19
Table 9. Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Noninstitutional Group Quarters Types: 2006 and 2008	21
Table 10. Comparison of Item Allocation Rates by Seven Major GQ Types: 2008	23
Table 11. Allocation Rates of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional GQ Types by Who Answered the Questions on the Questionnaire: 2008	26
Table 12. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by Who Answered the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional	30
Table 13. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology Used to Collect the Data in 2008: Institutional	33
Table 14. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology Used to Collect the Data in 2008: Noninstitutional	37
Table 15. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Institutional	40
Table 16. Allocation Rates for Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional	43

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Standard Errors for National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews Tables (1 – 4) shown in Section I	47
Appendix B. Universe Counts and Margins of Error (MOEs) for each of the Tables (5 – 14) shown in Section II	50

APPENDICES

Appendix A.	Page
Table	
1A. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews Standard Errors (SEs): 2006, 2007, and 2008	47
2A. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Institutional and Noninstitutional Group Quarters Standard Errors (SEs): 2006, 2007, and 2008	47
3A. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Major Institutional Group Quarters Types Standard Errors (SEs): 2006, 2007, and 2008	48
4A. National Level Group Quarters Population Response Rates with Reasons for Noninterviews by Major Noninstitutional Group Quarters Types Standard Errors (SEs): 2006, 2007, and 2008	49
Appendix B.	
6A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population: 2006 and 2008	50
7A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of selected items for the ACS GQ Population: 2006 and 2008 by Institutional/Noninstitutional	51
8A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of Selected Items for the ACS GQ population by Major Institutional Group Quarters Type: 2006 and 2008	52
9A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Noninstitutional Group Quarters Types: 2006 and 2008	54
11A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Major Institutional GQ Types by Who Answered the Questions on the Questionnaire: 2008	56
12A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of Selected Sample Items for the ACS GQ Population By Who Answered the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional	58
13A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of selected items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology used to collect the data in 2008: Institutional	60
14A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by the Methodology used to collect the data in 2008: Noninstitutional	63
15A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) questionnaire in 2008: Institutional	65
16A. Margins of Error (MOE) for the Percent Allocations of Selected Items for the ACS GQ Population by Use of Administrative Records to Answer the Questions on the ACS-1(GQ) Questionnaire in 2008: Noninstitutional	67

References

American Community Survey (ACS): How to Use the Data: Quality Measures. Accessed January 20, 2010 ([http://www.census.gov/acs/www/UseData/sse/.](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/UseData/sse/))