

STUDY SERIES
(*Survey Methodology* #2013-05)

**Ethnographic Study of the Group Quarters Population
in the 2010 Census: Group Homes for Women
and Military Group Quarters**

Susan Dewey¹
Anna Chan

¹University of Wyoming

Center for Survey Measurement
Research and Methodology Directorate
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, D.C. 20233

Report Issued: February 6, 2013

Disclaimer: This report is released to inform interested parties of research and to encourage discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

1 Executive Summary

As part of the 2010 Census Ethnographic Study of Group Quarters (GQ) populations, this report presents ethnographic research findings on two types of GQ facilities: group homes for women who are victims of domestic violence (DV) and military barracks. The Census Bureau defines group quarters as 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 to its residents (U.S. Census Bureau 2009). Group quarters can include, but are not limited to, federal detention centers, residential treatment centers, college/university student housing, group homes for adult women, and military barracks.

Findings are based upon ethnographic data gathered through participant observation and semi-structured interviews with GQ staff at three group homes for women (GQ 1-3) and one military facility (GQ 4), observation of the decennial enumeration in two GQ facilities, and observation of the administration of the American Community Survey (ACS) at a skilled nursing facility. Data collected in four GQ facilities between late January 2010 and May 30, 2010 comprised: fieldnotes based upon a combined total of 136 hours of participant observation, 12 semi-structured interviews, decennial enumeration observations in two facilities under study, and the ACS observation. An alternate roster for Census day (April 1st, 2010) was compiled based upon administrative records obtained from two facilities to allow for a matching study in the near future. This report provides suggestions for carrying out further research for a Census Coverage Measurement (CCM) study for these types of group quarters. These suggestions are based upon this study's two central research questions, which seek to ascertain (1) the social and contextual aspects of the residents' living arrangements that impacted the accuracy of the 2010 Census enumeration and (2) the social factors that may affect the success of a 2020 Census coverage measurement (CCM) study.

Seven social and contextual aspects that may have impacted the accuracy of the 2010 Census enumeration at group homes for women were identified: (1) gradual shift from activist to professionalized sphere; (2) complexity of living arrangements; (3) social services fatigue; (4) emotionally fraught nature of everyday life; (5) impact of trauma; (6) frequency of mental illness and addiction recovery; and (7) problems with literacy. This study identified four primary social dynamics that are likely to impact the implementation of a CCM study, including: (1) recent negative experiences with the 2010 Census enumeration at DV-oriented GQ facilities; (2) seasonal variations in population levels; (3) restricted access to administrative records; and (4) variability of administrative record reliability at DV-oriented GQ facilities. This report contains seven recommendations for methodologies and procedures that could be used to carry out a CCM study at DV-oriented GQs:

- Create a sampling frame for CCM: Measure coverage at group homes for women using the National Network to End Domestic Violence's comprehensive list of the 2,000 DV-oriented facilities in the U.S. This list would allow for the assessment of the applicability of type codes on the Group Quarters Validation Questionnaire by matching these with the GQ facilities classified by Census workers using the Questionnaire as either "Type Code 801 Group Homes Intended for Adults" or "Type Code 904 Religious Group Quarters or Domestic Violence Shelter." Many DV-oriented GQ facilities do not fall neatly into either category and there is considerable potential for misclassification using the current type codes, which could result in an under-count of women living in DV-oriented GQ

facilities via their enumeration at a type of facility that is not specifically classified as a DV-related facility.

- Randomly sample DV GQ for CCM: Create an accurate list of DV-oriented GQ facilities using the matching exercise described above as soon as possible after the enumeration in order to allow for enough time for matching, sample selection, and training to conduct a CCM. From this list, randomly select DV-oriented GQ facilities for voluntary participation in a CCM study, which will involve simplified, streamlined communication between a single Census Bureau worker and a single Census Bureau point of contact at the GQ.
- Use tailored protocol appropriate for DV GQ: Provision of this report's recommended protocol to Census Bureau workers who will carry out future enumerations and CCM, which will minimize the time burden placed upon GQ staff by the Census Bureau. This report contains a detailed protocol for Census Bureau workers' initial contact with the facility and emphasizes the need for consistent, streamlined information to be conveyed from the GQ point of contact to the Census Bureau point of contact.
- Methods for conducting CCM in DV GQs: Provision of options to staff at group homes for women from Census Bureau point of contact to GQ point of contact regarding participation in CCM. These options for DV-oriented GQs which opt to be included in the CCM study could include: (1) facility self-enumeration to be completed by facility staff using modified, limited use of administrative records; and (2) Census-improvement directed focus groups with GQ staff and, if possible, residents.
- Use administrative records for CCM: Clarify the legal means by which the Census Bureau can persuade GQ facilities bound by confidentiality regulations, including DV-oriented GQ facilities, residential drug and alcohol treatment programs, and psychiatric institutions, to share their administrative records. Obtaining access to these records will be one method for the Census Bureau to assess the accuracy of the enumeration at such facilities.
- Further research: Conduct further ethnographic research on the social realities that help to shape the residence identities of low income women and their families. Populations of particular interest include women who have recently left DV-oriented GQ facilities, women using drop-in centers for street sex workers and addicts, and minors in complex custody arrangements and/or GQ facilities. This would help CCM by presenting a clearer picture of the fluidity of such populations.

The social and contextual factors that may have impacted the accuracy of the 2010 Census enumeration at the military barracks included: (1) the military culture of compliance with federal government requirements, and (2) characteristics of pre-deployment living arrangements. CCM success at military facilities may be impacted by (1) population fluidity and (2) a high level of organization. This report contains three recommendations for alternate CCM at military facilities:

- Measure population fluidity over a 12-month period at military GQs using accessible administrative records known as “boots on ground numbers,” which simply count the number of residents present on a given day, to determine if sufficient population variations exist to warrant a follow-up survey at a different time of year.
- Assess coverage error at military GQs using administrative records. “Boots on ground” numbers, which record the numbers of troops resident on base on any given day, are available through the Office of Public Affairs, which exists at every military facility. More detailed records containing names, dates of birth, ethnicity, and alternate address need to be pursued through the Office of the Judge Advocate General (JAG), the legal branch of the U.S. Armed Forces.
- Coverage error at military GQs could also be assessed by conducting a matching exercise at randomly selected military GQ facilities to determine how often individuals complete both the Individual Census Report (ICR) and the Military Census Report (MCR) due to the mandatory nature of MCR completion among military GQ residents.

2 Introduction

The goal of this study, which is one of six independent studies of six Group Quarters (GQ) populations, was to understand the process of enumerating individuals living in group homes and military quarters during the 2010 Census. We sought to discover what types of census enumeration of group homes for women and military populations would lead to the most complete and accurate count of these populations. We also sought to understand whether a Census Coverage Measurement (CCM) study would be feasible for these populations. For this study, the first author (Dewey) performed the fieldwork and ethnographic research based on her expertise and experience in these areas; the second author, the Census Bureau lead researcher (Chan) guided the design of the study and the overall implementation and reporting of the findings.¹

The U.S. Census Bureau is interested in developing the most feasible method to evaluate the accuracy of the census count in the type of living arrangement known as “group quarters,” defined as 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 the residents (U.S. Census Bureau 2009.) Group quarters can include, but are not limited to, federal detention centers, residential treatment centers, college/university student housing, group homes for adult women, and military barracks. This research is part of a larger 2010 Census Ethnography Study of Group Quarters (GQ) populations. This report targets two types of group quarters—domestic violence (DV) oriented group homes for adult women and military quarters—and employs an ethnographic approach to assist the Census Bureau in identifying and analyzing social, cultural and economic factors that may affect its ability to accurately enumerate individuals housed in DV oriented GQs for adult women and military barracks.

The four GQs facilities covered in this report vary considerably in size and character and it is acknowledged that study two, on military barracks, has some shortcomings because only one facility was observed. All names used throughout this report are pseudonyms. (Please see Appendix A for an abbreviated guide to the use of pseudonyms.) In the interests of clarity, this report will first describe the ethnographic methods used for both studies. Following the methods section, it provides the background, sample descriptions, ethnographic findings and recommendations for DV-oriented GQs. The report on military barracks follows in the same format.

3 Descriptions of Ethnographic Methods Employed

3.1 Definition of ethnography and ethnographic methods

Ethnography, defined as “the art and science of describing another culture” (Fetterman 2009), is the chief methodological means by which cultural anthropologists seek to understand the social dynamics of particular communities. Ethnography relies upon information gathered by the researcher through participating in and observing aspects of everyday life. The central goal of ethnography is to arrive at a holistic understanding of why communities subscribe to certain beliefs or practices as part of their particular conception of the world. As a form of qualitative inquiry, ethnography offers “a way of seeing” (Wolcott 2008) that captures the nuanced realities of everyday life and thus provides data that is otherwise unobtainable from quantitative methods

¹ The first person reporting of field observations references the perspective of the first author.

such as surveys. Zaharlick identifies the three primary elements of ethnography as comprised of: (1) developing relationships with individuals in the group under study to facilitate the exchange of information; (2) assuming the group's perspective; and (3) using firsthand observation of the group's activities over an extended period of time (Zaharlick 1992).

One of ethnography's central goals is to understand how individuals in the group under study create meaning, which necessitates learning about ideologies prevalent within the group (Thomas 1993). Thus ethnography also requires a "holistic orientation" (Fetterman 1998) and "demands a great deal of time in the field to gather the many kinds of data that together create a picture of the social whole. It also requires multiple methods and multiple hypotheses to ensure that the researcher covers all angles" (Fetterman 1998:29). In addition to the juxtaposition of data with findings presented in the existing ethnographic literature on adult group homes for women and military barracks, this ethnographic study employed four ethnographic methods in order to answer the project's central research questions and develop recommendations for CCM: (1) participant observation; (2) post-enumeration semi-structured interviews; (3) unobtrusive observation of the decennial Census enumeration; (4) independent enumeration using ethnographic methods. The specificities of each method are detailed below.

3.2 Participant observation

Participant observation is a most valuable ethnographic tool primarily because it so effectively allows the researcher to witness and document the everyday behaviors of individuals in a group while acquiring an in-depth knowledge of the hierarchies and power structures that inform everyday life for group members (Babbie 2001; Bernard 1994; Emerson, Fretz & Shaw 1995). Participant observation is the methodology most commonly used by social science researchers as the basis of data collection for ethnography. Most anthropologists broadly define participant observation as studying a group by sharing in its activities, although the degree to which these activities are actually shared varies from field site to field site.

This methodology also allows for richly detailed descriptions based upon the researcher's interactions of the group's mundane activities (Dewalt and Dewalt 2002). Through participant observation, the researcher becomes embedded in the group in ways quite similar to the ways that journalists embed themselves in military units to provide up-to-date reportage. The nature of this involvement in the group by virtue of being physically present in it so often allows the researcher to gather information and solicit individual perspectives in ways that would be otherwise impossible for casual observers or institutional representatives (Burawoy, Burton, Ferguson & Fox 1991). The frequent physical presence of the researcher at the field site also tends to encourage unsolicited (and often quite insightful) commentary from group members, who typically grow accustomed to the unobtrusive presence of the researcher. Anthropologist Sherry Ortner notes that "Ethnography of course means many things. Minimally, however, it has always meant the attempt to understand another life world using the self- as much of it as possible- as an instrument of knowing" (Ortner 1995: 173).

In this study, participant observation was employed prior to the Census enumeration. My primary goal in employing participant observation was to answer my first research question, designed to ascertain the social and contextual aspects that impacted the accuracy of the 2010 Census enumeration. My secondary goal was to identify the social factors that may affect the success of a 2020 Census coverage measurement (CCM) study. Informal interactions with staff and residents in the course of my participant observation at each GQ facility answered the

remainder of research question two, which sought to ascertain the characteristics of residents' living arrangements.

I spent a total of 75 hours of participant observation at GQ 1 "New Directions," 24 hours of participant observation at GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter," 14 hours at GQ 3 "Safe Harbor," and 28 hours of participant observation at GQ 4 "Base One."

3.3 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews resemble a lengthy conversation focused upon a particular topic (Babbie 2001) and were aided by the attached list of guiding questions for staff and residents at the four GQ facilities (See Appendix B). I conducted twelve semi-structured interviews (three interviews in GQ1, two in GQ2, three in GQ 3 and five in GQ4), each of which lasted approximately one hour in length with GQ staff at all four facilities after census enumerations had been concluded. These interviews were complemented by the interactions I had with GQ staff and residents through my participant observation by directly assessing GQ staff members' impressions and understandings of the census enumeration process. These semi-structured interviews helped to clarify how GQ staff members' beliefs and perceptions influence their interactions with the Census Bureau and its representatives. In order to avoid influencing the census enumeration or other outcomes in any way, semi-structured interviews were only conducted with staff members at each of the GQ facilities after the enumeration had taken place.

3.4 Observation of the decennial census enumeration

My previous and extensive participant observation at one of the group homes for women featured in this study enabled me to observe the census enumeration in an unobtrusive manner. Immediately following my observation of the March 30 enumeration at one of the group homes for women (during which the census enumerator assumed I was a shelter staff member), I spent almost two hours with Angela, the GQ staff member who was the designated Census Bureau point of contact. While my presence during the April 1 enumeration at the military barracks was somewhat obtrusive because I am not a member of the military, my previous observations at the facility ensured that my presence did not alter the enumeration in any significant way.

3.5 Independent enumeration using ethnographic methods at domestic violence-oriented group quarters

As part of the evaluation study, I obtained administrative records documenting residents' birthdates, room numbers, number of co-resident children and racial and ethnic information for two group homes for women. I used the administrative records to create a list of residents who were staying at these facilities on April 1, 2010 during my usual observation and I used the list as the true census count – the gold standard – to match with the administrative records obtained from these two facilities. Although the records did not use names, it was fairly simple to identify residents using the information on age, race and number of children. I visited GQ 1 "New Directions" (please see section entitled "Study One: DV-Oriented Group Homes for Women" for a detailed discussion of the facilities studies) every week between January 9 and May 30, spending a total of 75 hours there and making considerable efforts to conduct my observations at varying times of day in order to ascertain residents' regular patterns of movement. I also spent a

total of 24 hours conducting observations at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” most of which took place during the Wednesday evening support groups.

4 Research Questions

My study of four GQ facilities was guided by two central questions: (1) what social and contextual aspects impacted the accuracy of the 2010 Census enumeration? and (2) What social factors may affect the success of a 2020 Census coverage measurement (CCM) study? To answer these questions, I employed the methods described in Section 2.

5 Study One: Domestic Violence-Oriented Group Homes for Women

5.1 Literature review: Domestic violence-oriented group quarters

Individuals who do not have a fixed residential address can be difficult for the Census Bureau to reach for the purposes of enumeration. Indeed, many researchers have noted that inaccurate statistical measurement of transient or otherwise marginalized populations can have serious consequences for society at large (Bell & Cohen, eds. 2009; Iyengar & Sabik 2009; Urla 1993). When such individuals remain uncounted, it has been argued, they are rendered part of a socially invisible population (Casper & Moore 2009). Yet anthropologists who work with communities that seek to remain anonymous often note the great lengths that individuals go to in order to keep their identities hidden. For instance, research by social scientists such as Patricia Adler (1993), Philippe Bourgois (2009; 1995) Sophie Day (2007; 1998), Eliot Liebow (1995), Cecilie Hoigard and Liv Finstad (1992), Timothy Pippert (2007), Beth Richie (2000), James Spradley (1999), Sudhir Venkatesh (2006) and Alisse Waterston (1999) detail the considerable efforts that homeless, drug addicted or abused individuals sometimes make to avoid state surveillance of any kind.

A considerable body of scholarly literature in the social sciences demonstrates that group homes for women are unique because many of their residents wish to remain anonymous out of fear of the abusers or other conditions that have placed them in the group home (Baldwin 2004; Brandwein 1999; West 2002; Wingwood, DiClemente & Raj 2000). Fear of an abuser or other sources of threat might play a role in the decision of adult women in group homes to complete census forms fully and accurately, as the trauma they have undergone may have seriously eroded their trust in any form of authority (Herman 1992; Raphael 2004; Rivera 2008). Indeed, such women may be concerned that efforts to enumerate them could be motivated by instrumental concerns, such as surveillance or punishment by law enforcement officials, including deportation (Augustín 2007; Chang 2000; Dewey 2008; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001). Serious trust issues are at work for female victim-survivors of abuse, who are at greater risk of sexual exploitation and homelessness (Baker, Cook & Norris 2003; Browne & Bassuk 1997; Browne 1998; Jasinki, Wesely, Wright & Mustaine 2010; Kushel, Evans, Perry, Robertson & Moss 2003; Rotherman et al. 1996; Simons & Whitbeck 1991).

Women in DV-oriented group homes experience enormous socioeconomic difficulties that influence their behaviors and beliefs, making them grant a low priority to activities such as completing the Individual Census Report (ICR). These include financial worries (Blank & Barr 2009; Edin & Lein 1997; Holloway et al. 2001) and fears about their children’s futures (Connolly 2000; Dewey 2011; Edin & Kefalas 2007; Krane & Davies 2002; Polakow 1993).

Some women may also worry that giving information about themselves as GQ residents to the Census Bureau may jeopardize their already bleak work prospects (Ehrenrich & Hochschild 2004; Gerson 2005) or limit their ability to obtain welfare benefits in the future (Hancock 2004) by identifying them as members of a stigmatized group. Although this may not reflect the reality of policy and procedures related to obtaining low wage work or welfare benefits, some women nonetheless fear public exposure of their history of abuse.

Women living in DV-related facilities may also fear forced separation from their children by those in positions of authority, particularly if they are addicted to drugs or alcohol (Kielty 2008; Litzke 2004). This belief, like those regarding low wage work and welfare benefits, is rooted in women's life experiences of marginalization by authority rather than in actual policies and practices. Such women particularly fear that individuals in positions of power, particularly those at the Department of Family and Social Services, may separate them from their children due to their history of involvement with an abusive man. Scholarly literature clearly documents the way that such beliefs stem from the fact that many residents in domestic violence-related facilities live in a permanent state of anxiety and heightened fear, and their "experiences with rape, incest and child abuse had long-term effects on their ability to trust others, to feel safe" (Rivera 2008: 54).

This kind of suspicion of authority is compounded for resident women from minority communities (Abraham 2000; Counts, Brown & Campbell 1999, 1992; Kanuha 1996; Richie 2000, 1996; West 2002), and for women with addiction or substance abuse problems (Braitstein, Li, Tyndall, Spittal, O'Shaughnessy, Schilder, Johnson, Hogg & Schechter 2003; Fals-Stewart, Golden & Schumacher 2003; Fowler & Faulkner 2006; Litzke 2004) or mental illness (Fischbach & Herbert 1997; Herman 1992). Social science researchers have noted the frequency with which constant stress, trauma and deprivation can lead to mental illness and, in turn, how variably such conditions are diagnosed, or change diagnosis, with inadequate medical care (Campbell et al. 1997; Connolly 2000; Ratner 1993; Silva et al. 1997).

Race and social class may also play significant roles in decision-making processes regarding census participation, particularly for communities with a history of government disenfranchisement. Such communities include, but are not limited to, African-Americans, Hispanics and individuals living in poverty (Neubeck & Cazanave 2001; Willis 1981; Zelizer 1997). To ensure that this population does not remain statistically invisible, this report describes the factors that influence women's decision-making processes vis-à-vis participation in the census, and offers recommendations for CCM evaluation in such domestic violence-oriented GQs.

Social science research also indicates that the organizational philosophies evinced by individual domestic violence-related facilities directly impact the services and treatment that residents (and outsiders) receive. Rothenberg (2003) and Schechter (1996; 1982) note that the first domestic violence-related facilities for women began to appear in the 1970s, when violence against women was solely an activist issue addressed by the women's movement and victim-survivors of abuse. Wies (2006) observes that this activist orientation is in sharp contrast to the high degree of government involvement prevalent in shelters today. These differences manifest themselves along a continuum ranging from feminist empowerment models that stress individual decision-making to more regimented, authoritarian structures, and the impacts of these very different philosophical orientations have been well documented in the scholarly literature (Hassler 1995; Kendrick 1998; Mann 2002; Markowitz & Tice 2002; Ogle & Baer 2003;

O'Sullivan & Carlton 2001; Riger, Bennett, Wasco, Schewe, Frohmann, Camacho & Campbell 2002; Rodriguez 1998; Schmitt & Martin 1999; Tierney 1982).

Scholarly literature convincingly demonstrates that individuals living in group quarter facilities experience incongruence between residence identity, defined as the place where individuals are housed, and individual notions of "home." For instance, sociologist Sandra Enos has documented how women prisoners struggle to maintain their roles as mothers and family members against what Enos terms "the dominant family ideology," a set of exclusionary social norms that do not reflect the life realities of many poor families. According to Enos, these factors include the following assumptions:

- (1) all family members co-reside in a single unit;
- (2) the family is headed by a male who provides essential economic support to the conjugal unit;
- (3) socialization of family members into appropriate gender roles is essential;
- (4) the interests of all family members are unitary and relations within the family are harmonious, and
- (5) families are economically self-sufficient, take care of their members, and are not dependent on the state or on extended family members (Enos 2001: 23).

This population fluidity and complexity of residence identities is echoed in other academic literature on group quarter populations. In my review of the literature on women's prisons (Enos 2001; Kruitschnitt & Gartner 2005; Owen 1998; Rathbone 2005; Rierdan 1997), researchers consistently emphasize the nexus of abuse, addiction and other factors that closely resemble the characteristics of women living in domestic violence-oriented group quarter facilities. In one study of women prisoners, for instance, female inmate Dawn is quoted as observing, "This isn't a prison for criminals, it's a prison for drug addicts" (Rierdan 1997: 99).

This review of the literature clearly illustrates that the Census Bureau faces several challenges in seeking to enumerate those individuals who are resident in domestic violence-oriented group homes for women. Scholarly work on these populations indicates that residence identity is, at best, complex in these types of facilities, and that the nature of life in domestic violence-oriented group homes for women presents a potential for undercount.

5.2 Background on study samples (GQs 1-3)

The first group home, GQ 1 "New Directions," is a longer-term residential facility for women and their children who have experienced domestic violence (DV). It has a maximum capacity of 120 resident women and children, and is located in a large Midwestern town. The second group home, GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter," is a residential facility that temporarily houses women and their children fleeing violence at home. It is located quite close to GQ 1 "New Directions," with which it frequently coordinates activities, and has a maximum capacity of approximately 20 women and children. The third group home, GQ 3 "Safe Harbor," is a longer-term residential facility for women and their children who have escaped life-threatening DV. Located in a major Midwestern city, it has a maximum capacity of 144 residents.

5.2.1 GQ 1 "New Directions"

GQ 1 "New Directions" is a four-story facility centrally located in a large Midwestern town, and provides housing for 28 poor and very poor families headed by women who have experienced DV. Maximum resident capacity at GQ 1 "New Directions" is approximately 120 residents, with one adult female and up to four children per individual apartment, and residents

may stay in the facility for up to two years. Exceptions to this two-year residency rule are made for women who will complete a degree program within six months, who have safety concerns that necessitate their remaining in the facility, or who are participating in a Habitat for Humanity project that demands they contribute a certain number of labor hours in the form of “sweat equity.” The waiting list for potential residents is often long and other women stay in more temporary facilities like GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” with relatives or friends, or with their abusers because they have nowhere else to go until a space becomes available. GQ 1 “New Directions” partners with the town’s Housing Authority to provide Project-Based Housing Assistance Payments (also known as Project-Based Section 8 or PBS8), to 22 out of the 28 apartments. This is a significant source of funding that allows GQ 1 “New Directions” to charge income-sensitive rents equaling 30 percent of a resident’s total annual income. Unlike Tenant-Based Section 8, PBS8 is not transferable to other housing and can only be used for tenancy at GQ 1 “New Directions.” The remaining six apartments are reserved for women ineligible for Section 8 because of a previous criminal conviction. GQ 1 “New Directions” was founded in 1998 after GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” staff made a collaborative effort to find longer-term housing for women who left their facility. Prior to the opening of GQ 1 “New Directions,” the waiting list for public housing was almost 2,000 applicants long, and so the vast majority of women and their children were faced with a choice of becoming homeless or returning to their abusers.

Visitors to GQ 1 “New Directions” must ring a buzzer in order to enter the building, which is a rather unique security feature in the part of the Midwest where my research was conducted. This security feature in itself indicates to visitors that this is not an ordinary housing facility. The security buzzer alerts a staff member, who then opens two security doors after determining the purpose of the visit. The lobby area is spacious, with a large reception desk area at its center where donated clothing and other items are available for residents to take as they need. A female staff member or volunteer always sits behind this desk to answer what is known as the “crisis line,” a phone dedicated to the receipt of calls from women who have experienced intimate partner violence. Two extremely cramped staff offices, separated by a glass partition, are located behind the reception desk and face the street, which allows staff members to monitor activities outside the facility using both the surveillance cameras and the view from their desks. Every inch of space is utilized in this small area, which is overfilled with drawers and binders labeled “Abuser Stats,” “Head Start Applications,” “Applications,” and “Pamphlets.”

To the left of the reception desk is the community room, a large space with a table, chairs and several couches. This room is used for meetings with residents as well as for private “intake” meetings, in which staff members, known as advocates, record prospective residents’ experiences with abuse to determine their eligibility for residency. Doors and walls on the ground floor are covered with informational posters on upcoming events as well as the rules of the facility. A permanent poster clearly labeled “In-house Babysitting Passes” informs residents that “Residents caring for another resident’s child must have a pass on file if the mother is out of the building weekdays between 10pm and 7 am.” Visitors to GQ 1 “New Directions” are immediately struck by the bright colors and open space of the facility, and staff members often note, as Annie did, “We want the women to feel that they are at home.” The three upper floors of the building contain the 28 apartments for resident women and their children, a food pantry, and the “share store,” a room full of donated clothes and personal hygiene articles that resident women and children can take as needed.

All activities at GQ 1 “New Directions” are informed by its organizational philosophy, which focuses upon self-empowerment for residents and, more broadly, effecting social change in the community by providing a safe environment for DV victim-survivors. Its resident handbook notes that the numerous free services it provides, including childcare, group therapy, legal aid, support groups, and a food pantry, are designed to “help a woman who feels powerless to regain a sense of strength and control over her life.” Every resident has a Case Manager, an advocate who works with her as an individual to help her break the cycle of abuse while learning skills that will help her to be self-sufficient, which the facility staff members describe as the ability to “secure permanent, affordable, safe housing, achieve economic security, and develop the capacity for self-determination.”

5.2.2 Background on GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter”

This facility is located in a Victorian house on a corner of a residential area, and could easily be mistaken for a private home at first glance due to its large, roomy front porch complete with comfortable rocking chairs. Converted from a single family’s private residence into a domestic violence shelter in 1981, it has a maximum capacity of approximately 20 residents. The ground floor is entirely devoted to the staff’s administrative area, the volunteer office for the rape and DV crisis lines, and the combined kitchen and dining room. The stairs are directly opposite the front door and lead upwards to several dorm-style bedrooms and a community room with comfortable chairs, couches and a large television. Despite this separation by floor, GQ staff in the downstairs offices can always hear children crying, water running, toilets flushing and other sounds of everyday life as they go about their work tasks. Likewise, women and their children going about their daily activities in the kitchen or upstairs living area are always acutely aware of the presence of GQ staff members.

The tense, fast-paced work environment at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” is similar to that of GQ 1 “New Directions,” and all staff members have the world-weary air of career social service providers. In contrast to GQ 1 “New Directions,” the inside of GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” is a bit run-down and gloomy despite its homelike exterior. The first thing visitors see upon entering the facility is a dirty waiting area, which is lined with mismatched second-hand chairs of varying age and quality. One side of the waiting area is frequently filled with plastic garbage bags containing donated clothes awaiting distribution to residents, and a large bookshelf stacked with various items of potential use to residents, including open boxes of pink tampons, DVDs, and personal hygiene articles.

Residents of GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” can use the childcare and food services program at GQ 1 “New Directions,” and the focus at this facility is also on breaking the cycle of violence and obtaining permanent housing for women and their children. These efforts are quite a bit more concentrated than they are at GQ 1 “New Directions” due to the more fluid nature of residents at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” who may stay at the facility for just one night or, in extreme cases, up to one year. There is no predetermined minimum or maximum length of stay at this facility, although staff members do their best to help women find more permanent accommodation. Residents in the facility must report to staff members five days a week on their progress toward filing a protective order against their abuser, finding long-term housing and applying for social services benefits, such as food stamps, for themselves and their children. Women must complete one chore a day and take turns cooking for the group in the evening.

Every Wednesday night, following dinner, there is a support group based upon a theme selected by residents.

5.2.3 Background on GQ 3 “Safe Harbor”

This facility is a large and rather imposing three story building near the downtown area of a large Midwestern city. It combines both the long and short-term services offered by GQ 1 “New Directions” and GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” in a single extremely high security building. As with GQs 1 and 2, residents at GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” range in length of stay from one night in the emergency shelter to a maximum of two years in the longer-term housing. Guests are not allowed into the building, random drug testing is mandatory for all residents, and even social services personnel are required to show identification and state the purpose of their visit through an intercom system before GQ staff allow them to enter the building. It has a maximum capacity of 144 residents, although its average number of residents is approximately 110 per night. The environment at GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” is much more structured than at GQ 1 “New Directions” or GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” and the kinds of informal interactions that regularly take place between staff and residents at those facilities are rare at GQ 3 “Safe Harbor.”

The entrance to both the emergency shelter and the longer-term housing area is located at the back of the building, with buzzers on the outer doors that link to the front desk, where staff members determine who is allowed entry through an intercom system. Upon entering the building, a visitor has a distinct sense of being in an institutional living facility despite the beautifully designed color scheme of dark purple, lavender and teal. Two nicely dressed female staff members in their early 30s generally sit in the reception area, which is to the right of the entrance. The first thing a visitor sees when entering is a wooden staircase with teal carpeting that goes up to the living area. The meal room is to the left of the administrative area, with offices in a hallway to the right. Six television screens, which display the black and white images captured by the security cameras surrounding the building, are mounted on the wall behind the front desk. On the wall opposite the door that allows staff to enter the reception area, organized drawers and shelves contain phone books and binders with labels bearing ominous names such as “Disaster Plan” and “Personal Safety Files.” Every fifteen minutes, an electronic alert, which sounds rather like a lighthouse bell, reminds staff members to ensure that no potential intruders are lurking outside the building.

5.2.4 Summary of common contextual factors that may affect population counts at GQs 1, 2 & 3

Despite their differences, all three DV-oriented GQs share a number of characteristics that present similar challenges for the purposes of carrying out CCM. DV-oriented GQ facilities feature an environment of constant motion and considerable emotional turmoil among both staff and residents due to the difficult and extremely intimate nature of their everyday interactions. Staff members are expected to have full knowledge of residents’ personal lives as well as their plans for the future, and residents sometimes resent this lack of emotional privacy, even in DV-oriented GQ facilities that allow for increased physical privacy, such as GQ 1 “New Directions” and GQ 3 “Safe Harbor.” For staff, this atmosphere of constant tension is reinforced (and, in some cases, exacerbated) by their knowledge that residents depend upon them for many aspects of their and their children’s daily survival.

This highly charged atmosphere also results from the need to maintain security measures at all times in order to ensure that residents' abusers do not enter the building with the intention of causing harm. This high level of security directly impacts the amount of access that outsiders, including Census Bureau employees, can expect to have to such facilities.

5.2.5 Decennial census enumeration

I observed the enumeration at GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter," which took place on March 30. GQ 1 "New Directions" was not enumerated. GQ 3 "Safe Harbor" was contacted in mid-May by a census enumerator who asked the director, "Juanita," to document the residents who were housed in the facility as of April 1.² When Juanita protested that this was an inefficient way to carry out the enumeration, the census worker told her that she was "very busy" and it was impossible to reach every facility on April 1. This compounded Juanita's already negative experiences with census workers who she felt did not understand the unique dynamics of the population in her facility and caused her to note, "I feel like we're being treated like homeless shelters, which is not what we are at all. Our population is totally different, and the person from the census that visited us had absolutely no sensitivity to that." She made this comment while recounting her interactions with a census worker who visited the facility in early February. The census worker had informed the director that she expected to speak directly with residents, or to give the census form directly to the residents, when the enumeration took place. The director felt that this displayed an extraordinary lack of sensitivity to the environment of constant fear in which the residents of GQ 3 "Safe Harbor" live.

The March 30 enumeration at GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter" took place at 1:00 pm. I arrived about fifteen minutes prior to the enumerator in order to be as unobtrusive as possible. "Angela," the staff point of contact for the enumeration at GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter" was visibly frustrated about the census enumeration. "Personally" she said, "I can't wait until this whole process is over, because I'm the point of contact and it's just been nonstop. I feel harassed." Although I did not prompt her to do so in any way, Angela was exceptionally eager to discuss her contacts with the Census Bureau, which she regarded as excessively frustrating. In order to avoid influencing the enumeration in any way, I suggested to Angela that we could speak about her experiences after the enumerator left.

The enumerator arrived promptly at 12:55 pm and introduced herself as "Frances," a tall woman in her mid-forties. Angela seated her next to me in the small room normally reserved for the private intake interview with residents, in which they are informed of the facility's rules and asked for information about their abuser. The phone rang and Angela got up to answer it, and the enumerator told her, "Take your time, because I need to get the forms together anyway." The enumerator assumed I was a shelter staff member and remarked, "I'm very nervous, because this is my first interview. Yesterday I did one with three other people, but this is my first one alone." The enumerator began compiling the census packets while waiting for Angela to return. Meanwhile, we could clearly hear Angela struggling on the phone with an automated response system from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Angela was sighing audibly as the system repeatedly refused to recognize the information she entered. Another phone rang, which Angela answered. It was a call on the crisis line, which provides assistance to women experiencing domestic violence. The call ended relatively quickly and Angela returned to the small intake room, looking exhausted. This series of events is significant in that it represents

² Note that all names in this report are pseudonyms. See Appendix A.

the kind of hyper-vigilance combined with slow-moving bureaucracy that frames the working environment of most DV shelters. Shelter staff must constantly monitor activities inside and outside the facility to ensure residents' safety, remain consistently available as counselors to women dealing with trauma, and yet must also conform to the requirements of granting agencies and government sponsors. There is a high potential for burnout and frustration among shelter staff like Angela as a result of this weighty combination of responsibilities.

The enumerator explained to Angela that she was there to distribute the Individual Census Report (ICR) forms to the residents. Angela said, "but the woman I met with said we're supposed to do the count on the 1st (of April)." The enumerator told her that this was incorrect. Angela persisted, saying, "Patty told me to do that," to which the enumerator responded, "She did? Well, she's my boss, so I guess that's right." Obviously embarrassed, the enumerator continued by asking how many forms needed to be completed. Angela said, "Right now we have three residents, but we've got more coming in tonight, and here you just never know (how many women and children might arrive)." The enumerator then showed Angela a letter from the Census Bureau on confidentiality, which Angela did not look at because she said she had already seen it. "I've read this," she said, "along with the information (on the census) from the State Coalition Against Domestic Violence (SCDV), so I'm overwhelmed. I've told the women that they can fill out the forms if they want to. They can use another name if they want to." The enumerator responded, "I'm not here to check the correctness of the form, but hopefully they can answer questions one through three. Now we're going to work through your roster. Can I get room numbers or names?" Angela responded by indicating that there were three residents that day, one of whom was a child. The enumerator asked if she could hand them the forms, to which Angela responded, "No, the census worker cannot interact with the clients (residents). We cannot give you names because we sign a confidentiality agreement with our clients. I can give you room numbers, because they don't change."

The enumerator then asked for room numbers to place on the forms, which she handed to Angela before mentioning that she needed to complete the envelopes as well. Angela asked, "So these forms are different from the forms we get in our homes?" The enumerator did not reply, and was clearly embarrassed that she did not know the answer. Angela looked visibly irritated and said, "That's the information I received. Do you have a different form? Do the children need separate forms?" The enumerator said that only the adults were supposed to complete forms, which Angela said was contradictory to what she had been told previously. The enumerator replied, "Let me check back and let you know. So I'm going to leave you three forms for three people." Angela grew even more frustrated, noting, "I'm confused, because Annie's letter (referring to a letter regarding census procedures for DV shelters sent by a representative from the National Network to End Domestic Violence) said that DV shelters should be counted in four stages between April first through the fifteenth." The enumerator ignored Angela's question by stating, "This should be simple with only three people." Angela then replied, "Look, the state tells us that children can't be counted, then you tell me that's true, but Annie's letter says that they should be counted." (Notably, I could not find any reference to children in this letter, which two shelter directors shared with me). The enumerator deflected Angela's comment by saying that she needed to finish preparing the envelopes.

Angela asked for extra forms for the women who planned to arrive at shelter that night, but the enumerator replied, "I'm going to wait and then call you tomorrow to see what the situation is, and how many people are here, and then I can bring you extra forms." Angela sighed audibly. The enumerator asked if there were any Spanish speakers (there were none) and then

prepared the envelopes with sticker labels as Angela watched her intently, clearly very impatient for the enumeration to be over. Outside the closed door, the phone rang constantly and there was a never-ending hum of activity and conversations between staff members and a few residents. Angela asked, "Okay, so I have a question on (question) number six on the form. It says, 'Do you live or stay at this facility most of the time?' What does that mean, so if they ask me I can tell them?" The enumerator paused, a perplexed look on her face, and asked about the average length of stay, which Angela described as highly variant, from one night to two months. The enumerator said, "Tell them that if they know it'll just be a few days or months, mark 'no'." Angela persisted, noting, "But they don't know, they're in transition, that's what I'm saying." For the third time, the enumerator ignored Angela's question, this time by going back to filling out the envelopes.

The enumerator then handed Angela three forms and then a fourth when Angela reminded her there was another resident. The enumerator then said she would call her to check the number of residents on April 1 in order to determine if additional forms were indeed required. Angela said, "Why don't you just give me your cell phone number? That way I can call you and tell you who's here." The enumerator refused, but she did call her supervisor, Patty, at this point to ask if children should fill out forms and if the count should be conducted as of March 29 or April 1. The supervisor confirmed that March 29 was the correct date. Angela asked, "So you don't care about the families coming in tonight?" and the enumerator said no, and added that she would return on March 31, the next day, to pick up the forms. "Okay," Angela said, "I'll ask them to do it. This process has been so frustrating." The enumerator then said goodbye and left. The enumerator's entire visit lasted just over one hour.

After the enumerator left, Angela shared her frustrations with the census enumeration process at length. Here is an excerpt from her unprompted comments, which, unfortunately, I have heard versions of at three other GQs for women fleeing violence at home:

I think that the whole process was frustrating, because we told them I was the contact person and so I got all this wacky information because whenever anything census-related came in it came to me. One census worker came to me and then I got information from the SCDV (the State Coalition Against Domestic Violence) and Annie (of the National Network to End Domestic Violence) about the law and what we are supposed to do (for the census)...(And then today) the census worker argued with me like I was incompetent... I felt like I wasted all this energy and time. In fact, I didn't even do my census form because I was so frustrated. How could she (the enumerator) not know whether the children should be counted? I want to tell the Census Bureau, y'all need to sit down and have a conversation. We tried our best, but after awhile we just wanted to give up. The first woman from the Census Bureau, Patty, came on a Tuesday to one of our staff meetings in February and scheduled the appointment for today. She said, 'I may not be the one who comes,' but she had all the information, and then (today) they sent this woman (the enumerator) instead. Like at the staff meeting, she (Patty) just showed up and the whole staff had to postpone what they were doing. I think the whole process could have been like this (snaps her fingers). They should have one person from the Census Bureau call the point of contact and give clear, consistent information- when they'll drop off the forms, what you'll need to fill them out, whether the kids need to be counted. Because I felt the integrity of our shelter was called into question when she didn't give me the extra forms for April 1st. This

was just an hour of wasted time- she didn't know anything. Y'all just need to have a conversation. My director said that we'll cooperate (with the census requirements) and then (once the preparations for the census began) we just felt harassed. Our integrity is being tested- we do \$100,000 grants all the time where we don't disclose the names (of our residents), this is not new to us. Don't make it so hard that agencies will just toss the forms. This is such a simple process and they're making it like it's brain surgery.

Overall, my assessment is that the enumeration at "Emergency Shelter" was very poorly done. Even more notably, the census point of contact at this facility felt that the enumeration was mishandled and that the enumerator was unprepared for the task of enumeration.

5.3 Participant observation results

During my 75 hours of participant observation at GQ 1 "New Directions," I sat behind the reception desk in the spacious ground floor lobby during these observations, which placed me at the center of life at the facility, privy to all office activities as well as to residents' movements in and out of the building. Many residents bring their infants and toddlers into this large, open area to socialize with staff and other residents throughout the day and evening, making this an ideal area for the observation of natural activities and interactions between staff and residents. Because female volunteers are also a common sight in this area, residents assumed that I was there to assist the facility in some capacity although, for ethical reasons, GQ staff members were fully aware of the census-related purposes behind my presence at the facility. I employed a similar observational strategy at GQ 3 "Safe Harbor."

I joined GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter" residents for Wednesday night support groups, which took place after dinner; I spent a total of 24 hours of participant observation at this facility. This proved to be the best strategy due to the small number of residents, all of whom were in a traumatized emotional state due to their recent experience with life-threatening DV. Staff members, who were very supportive of this study, were very clear that it would have been inappropriate for me to simply sit and observe activities in this facility, as the vast majority of residents are understandably wary of strangers. Fortunately, as was the case at GQ 1 "New Directions," female volunteers are not infrequent visitors to the Wednesday night support group, and I was welcomed by residents as a women's studies professor from a nearby university who enjoyed bringing residents dessert for them to share during group meetings.

I spent approximately 16 hours observing at GQ 3 "Safe Harbor" during both the extremely busy morning period and, on one occasion, at a mandatory post-dinner meeting for all residents. As was the case at GQ 1 "New Directions," the phone rings constantly with crisis calls or requests for information. Due to the highly structured and extremely hierarchical nature of this facility, the only viable observational strategy was for me to sit behind the reception desk with other staff members. My location behind staff members (near the wall, approximately three feet from the reception desk) probably led residents to believe I was also a staff member, as did the fact that I sat with staff members during the mandatory residents' meeting I attended. Most notably, I did not encounter a single individual at any of the four GQs that characterized the facility as their "home" in their discussions with staff members or other residents.

5.3.1 Complexity of individual residence identities at DV-oriented GQs

The patterns of residence identity among members of female-headed households at all three DV-oriented GQs are complex at best. For many such women, these patterns of serial temporary residence or multiple residences combine with abusive relationships to make them lifelong candidates for residence in a DV-oriented GQ facility. For instance, one woman had been to GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” ten times in two years, and another woman who was “new” to GQ 1 “New Directions” had actually lived there ten years ago. This combines with the high degree of shuffling that goes on when service providers try to accommodate as many needy individuals as possible. Advocates La Tanya and Sarah were particularly good at coordinating such moves--in one instance they moved a woman from GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” to GQ 1 “New Directions” so as to make room for a woman and her baby who needed space in GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter.” One of the consequences of such shuffling is that staff members often know more than residents do about their living arrangements. For example, Cherisse and her daughter Micky announced during one of my observations at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter”: “Guess what, everybody? I just found out that we’re moving to GQ 1 “New Directions” in two days! Isn’t that an improvement?” I knew about this from caseworker conversations the week before, but Cherisse had only been notified of her move two days in advance. So there is a pervasive familiarity staff have with resident’s lives that is definitely not reciprocal.

Even more notable for census purposes is the frequency with which women experience the cyclical nature of life with an abusive partner, a move into a precarious housing situation with friends or family, followed by residency in a DV-oriented GQ facility. Jolene from Mississippi spent most of one morning when I observed at GQ 1 “New Directions” waiting to talk to the site manager about her place on the waiting list. Jolene spent this time speaking with an advocate about living in Mississippi with her four children, where she grew up and where her parents still lived before she “ran away” to the Midwestern town where GQ 1 “New Directions” is located with her new husband. She then left this husband due to his abuse and moved herself and four children aged 4 to 16 into an apartment above a garage owned by her daughter’s boyfriend’s mother. Jolene explained, “She’s been real good to us, but things are getting kinda cramped.” She described spending as much time outside as possible, rolling trucks down the paved driveway with her 4-year-old to keep him occupied, and also getting free eggs from the daughter’s boyfriend’s mother’s chickens. “So tonight we’re having bacon and scrambled eggs, and tomorrow we’ll have fried eggs,” she joked by way of keeping her spirits up. Jolene left the GQ 1 “New Directions” after a thirty-minute meeting with the site manager, asking sadly as she opened the door, “So I guess I just keep calling back and checking every month, right?” Several months later Jolene came in on a Tuesday for another scheduled meeting with the site manager and told an advocate, “We’ve been all packed up since last Thursday because we were supposed to move in on Friday, but now it won’t be until next week, so I’m finally here to finish all the paperwork.” Unbeknownst to her, Jolene’s move was delayed by an outbreak of bedbugs that infested the apartment she was meant to move into.

Staff members at GQ 1 “New Directions” make a concerted effort to make the environment home-like for their residents. Leftover donated gifts from Christmas and new donations are saved and wrapped as birthday gifts for residents’ children, and yet even those who wish to see the GQ facility as their home are frequently confronted with obstacles to doing so by the constant reminders of their impermanence, including the frequency with which residents are locked out of the building when staff members change the building’s entry code. The older

children at GQ 1 “New Directions” have a long-standing game in which they try to guess the code and then share it with each other. Each time the code becomes public knowledge among the children, GQ staff change it. Annie, the GQ 1 “New Directions” volunteer coordinator and former facility resident, summarized how this process of being made to feel less important than others takes place in small ways: “When I lived here it used to bother me so much when I came home from work and after being so tired and with all my problems, the staff or volunteers had taken all the parking spots in the back. It really made me feel that this wasn’t my home.” These indices of privilege are clearly obvious to residents.

Perhaps because of this profound disconnection between their residence identity and their notion of “home,” many women in all three GQs struggled to maintain at least some connections to biological family members or fictive kin living outside the facilities. These family relationships can be complicated by a woman’s need to protect her children from an abusive or mentally ill spouse. For example, Sarah, a resident of GQ 3 “Safe Harbor,” was five months pregnant with her abuser’s child and yet I overheard her explaining to another resident that she was allowing him to pick the child’s middle name, as if they still constituted a united household. She added, “The problem is that I just can’t be with him right now because it’s not safe for the baby.”

It is not surprising, then, the children in such facilities can be considered to have higher rates of multiple residences than their peers living outside these facilities, particularly in instances where another party has joint custody. Grandparents, fathers and sometimes even aunts or uncles will frequently come to GQ 1 “New Directions” in order to take children away for visits of two nights or more, making it difficult to determine the children’s primary residence under any reasonable rule. One day at GQ 1 “New Directions” a resident signed in an older adolescent girl by saying “This is my daughter” and the girl immediately said, “I’m your adopted daughter, you have to tell them that because you know it’s gonna make a huge difference” and rolled her eyes. This is significant because it shows residents and their kin are aware of the pervasive surveillance governing the family relationships of residents.

As documented in this report’s literature review, these factors are particularly problematic for the Census Bureau’s purposes because they reveal the incongruence between residence identity and individual notions of “home.” This is the case across a variety of GQ facilities, particularly prison, drug treatment facilities and homeless shelters. It is important to emphasize that for some women in DV-oriented GQ facilities, there is no such thing as a residence identity. Indeed, one of the most striking aspects of this ethnographic study was the high degree of overlap between different types of GQ populations. For some of the women living at the three DV-oriented GQ facilities in this study, their next residence may well have been prison, particularly for drug abusers or those with child abuse or neglect cases before the courts, both of which are inseparable from the violent relationships in which some women opt for self-medication with drugs and alcohol despite the negative consequences for themselves and their children. This population fluidity is also evident in common vernacular language shared by residents in prisons and DV-oriented GQ facilities. Just as prison inmates often say things like “You have to do your own time (prison sentence), not let your time do you,” women in DV-oriented GQs also talk about how to handle an obvious transitional period in similar ways. Women might move from an emergency DV shelter such as GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” which is temporary, to a drug rehabilitation center, to live with friends or relatives, to a longer-term DV-oriented GQ facility like GQ 1 “New Directions” or GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” or back to life with their abuser, all within a space of 24 hours. There is also some degree of overlap between DV-

oriented GQ facilities and homeless shelters. When I was still seeking access to GQ sites in January 2010, I scheduled a joint meeting with the directors of GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” and “Sharon’s Place,” a homeless shelter. Both directors immediately drew my attention to the fact that their populations were shared to some extent, as well as to the fact that residents of their facilities frequently have no fixed address despite the fact that they may not be “homeless” in any conventional sense of the word. In a revealing statement worth quoting at length, the homeless shelter director explained:

I have a DV survivor, who is experiencing homelessness, who is from (a neighboring) county because there is no shelter there. She had an infection that needed treatment and (the neighboring) county said ‘she hasn’t been here in 30 days, so she’s not a resident.’ This kind of thing will skew the census data, because dislocated residents are being foisted upon us, so you’ll get accurate numbers but they won’t reflect the actual origin of their displacement. No funder will say that they are residents (of this community), but their bodies are here. We take women from everywhere, because a woman experiencing DV sometimes needs to be relocated. The state (in the Midwest) assigns our shelter counties, so (our shelter) is assigned three counties. As long as the compensation lasts, we can apply for them. As long as the women are from this service area they’re covered, but not if they are from outside. In our shelter we have women from all over the state. Sharon’s Place has a 10 day limit, but no one will be turned away...Family abandonment and abuse are both major causes of homelessness, so I think that there is a lot of overlap between DV victims and homelessness...I can promise you, though, shelter directors lie about where people come from, because they have to in order to keep their funding”

Some women who would prefer to stay in an emergency DV shelter sometimes end up in homeless shelters if there is absolutely no space at emergency DV shelter, although the staff at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” try to prevent this from happening because there are men at shelters, which can be difficult for some women leaving a violent relationship with a man. This is particularly significant because there are no single-sex homeless shelters in this area. Staying in a homeless shelter is often not even a possibility for women with children, because most regional homeless shelters will not take in children, who must be placed with relatives or friends instead. For example, Loretta had been resident for two weeks at “Sharon’s Place” when I began my observations there. She spent considerable amounts of time rearranging photos of her twin infants in a small plastic photo album. One of the infants had a hole in his throat and needed to be permanently attached to an oxygen machine. Loretta’s twins were living with an aunt while Loretta slept in the homeless shelter with her boyfriend, who her family would not allow to stay with them because of his drug use and frequent abusive behavior. As a notable exception, Loretta would rather stay in a homeless shelter with her boyfriend than with her children and aunt or relocate to GQ 1 “New Directions.”

A small but significant minority of women facing violence in their home choose to stay in a homeless shelter rather than in what they regarded as the more intrusive environment of the DV shelter. One night at the weather overflow program at “Sharon’s Place,” I met Ella, a woman in her early forties with long blonde hair and a face full of worry lines. As we stood talking in the dark as we waited for a student volunteer to come unlock the door to the shelter, she explained, “We have all kinds of women here, some can’t work because of disability. I’m here because I live with my sons and they’re crazier than me. I think a lot of women become homeless because of abuse. One woman is here because of a dispute, and she left on her own.”

This phenomenon of fluidity also works in the opposite direction, as some homeless women would prefer to stay in GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” but do not meet the criteria of abuse necessary in order to sleep there. This posed a serious ethical dilemma for staff members at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” prompting staff member Allison to note that:

We don’t take homeless women and they’re very hard to turn down. We try to let homeless women stay for two to three days on the couch if there is nowhere else for them to go, or sometimes people will drop off a mentally ill woman at midnight and we’ll let her stay until 9am, but she’ll have to go in the morning because we need to keep beds open for women in danger.”

In addition to the population fluidity between different types of GQs, a significant body of research has demonstrated that such residential impermanence clearly correlates with poverty, making fluidity in household composition normal in many poor families (Connolly 2000; Dewey 2011; Edin & Kefalas 2007; Edin & Lein 1997; Holloway et al. 2001; Susser 1982).

It is thus rather problematic that the category “Usual Housing Elsewhere” (UHE) is not allowed on the ICR form. This does not reflect the fact that, for the vast majority of people, GQ stays are episodic and temporary. In the case of GQs 1-3, residents typically envision their stay in such facilities as part of temporarily traumatic circumstances, though such a belief may also be a survival strategy on their part because such stays are part of a broader life pattern for quite a few residents.

5.3.2 Emotionally fraught nature of everyday life at domestic violence-oriented group quarters

The pervasive state of anxiety that characterizes the work environment at this facility stems from multiple factors, including (1) understaffing due to budgetary limitations; (2) the need to complete the minutiae of various state and federal grants, often with very little notice or ability to prepare; (3) the high frequency of sudden crises in residents’ daily lives; (4) acute staff awareness that all residents have been the target of life-threatening violence, and that their abusers could arrive at the facility at any time and place everyone in danger. This latter concern necessitates that staff members search a state criminal database for the name of every visitor who arrives at the facility. Anyone with a previous conviction of a violent offense is asked to leave the building. The office wall has a list of every resident’s first name alongside a column labeled “abuser” that lists the name or names of the men who have previously been charged with the rape, assault or battery of residents. Staff members often express significant frustration when residents attempt to reconcile with their abuser, especially since such reunions often take place within viewing distance of the front office’s windows. “Sometimes you’ll see them across the street because they’re trying to reconcile with their abuser” staff member Clarissa explained “but they (the men) can’t come in here once they’ve abused, because then we’re enabling the abuse.” As part of the facility’s philosophy of self-empowerment and individual decision-making, residents are not forbidden from meeting with their abusers outside the facility.

In this situation of perpetual state of action and movement, staff members must rotate shifts at the reception desk so that someone is always available to answer the phone and the securely locked door. I always sat near the staff member on duty in this area, and often marveled at their ability to focus on effectively responding to calls from women in crisis while surrounded by donated items piled on top of the reception desk and the constant hum of advocates’ discussing intimate details of residents’ lives in the office behind the desk. On a typical day, such

conversations, which take a casual tone due to their frequency despite the disturbing subject matter, revolve around residents' experiences with sexual abuse, physical violence, and child abuse. These often end with a disturbing assessment such as "she's on the edge, I don't know what is going to happen to her." The phone rings constantly, and residents frequently strike up conversations with staff members whenever they are not on the phone. The most common subjects of discussion among residents include children, plans to move into permanent housing, women's difficulties in obtaining social services (particularly food stamps), and, for some women, their progress in abstaining from substance abuse.

On a typical day at GQ 3 "Safe Harbor," the two staff members at the reception desk log every movement and activity that takes place at the facility by entering brief descriptions of them into their desktop computers between answering phone calls. Such notations often included such small details as "11:35 a.m. Resident backpack left in reception area; 11:40 Mary 135 (as residents are identified by room number and first name alone to preserve anonymity) out to work." This environment is much more controlled and secure than the rather relaxed atmosphere for residents at GQ 1 "New Directions" and GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter." Residents constantly approach staff members with requests for information, medicine and bus tickets, but there is never the kind of informal socializing that takes place at the other facilities, and these interactions are strictly about information exchange. In a rather typical example, a staff member behind the desk handed a young resident a form to bring to a social services office to petition for financial support from the city despite her former home's location in another county. The resident, whose arm was in a cast, said, "Can't you send it there?" to which the staff member firmly replied, "I can give you a bus ticket. They need to meet with you in person and they'll ask you some questions and you'll either get approved or denied. If you're approved, they'll start paying us from the day they meet you and that's one more day that we're not losing money from your room and board and that helps us out because we're a nonprofit." Staff frequently make it very clear to residents that the ability to stay at GQ 3 "Safe Harbor" is a privilege that must be earned.

Many women walk around the facility with babies or small children in their arms. All events are announced via intercom, so that promptly at 12:30, one of the staff members alerts residents "Attention ladies, lunch is now over." Residents are also paged via intercom to come to the front desk if a staff member needs information from them, and all residents are easily identifiable by the credit-card sized electronic building keys they wear on lanyards around their necks. Despite clear efforts to make the facility home-like in décor, all power and authority are clearly concentrated in the hands of staff behind the desk, who behave in a markedly different manner than those at GQ 1 "New Directions" and GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter." The front desk area "closes" from 11:30-12:30, when the staff members behind the desk catch up with record-keeping. No matter how dire the situation, residents are coldly informed, "Front desk is closed until 12:30."

As a consequence, CCM must be designed in a way that respects these social dynamics, different institutional philosophies, and minimizes the time burden placed upon GQ staff and residents. My recommendations for doing so are featured in sections five and six.

5.3.3 Seasonal variations in population levels at domestic violence-oriented group quarters

Although domestic violence occurs across the socioeconomic spectrum, DV-oriented GQs are home to a particular socioeconomic demographic. Women at such facilities are generally poorer, less formally educated and have fewer resources to draw upon than their more privileged peers, who have social networks, savings and credit to draw upon if they are faced with violence in the home (Brandwein 1999; Fowler & Faulkner 2006; Ogle & Baer 2003). Annual administrative statistics from GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” covering several hundred female residents served throughout each year clearly illustrates the poverty that frames the lives of women in such facilities: 65 percent of women had an annual income of less than \$5,000, 14 percent earned between \$5000 to \$10,000 in a year, and 17 percent earned between \$10,000 to \$25,000 annually and the remaining 4 percent had no income. Although similar statistics are unavailable for GQ 1 “New Directions” and GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” the numbers would likely be quite similar, as my participant observation findings indicated that vast majority of women in these facilities relied on low wage work or Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) benefits to support themselves and their children.

The fluidity of this population is also weather-dependent, and reaches its maximum in the cold winter months. Notably, GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” was at its maximum capacity of about twenty residents when I conducted observations there during the cold winter months of January, February and March, yet was almost empty at the time of the enumeration. The director of GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” explained that this low number of residents was typical of early April due to the proximity of the school year’s end, when women are: (1) less inclined to disrupt their children’s routines by removing them from school to relocate to a shelter and/or (2) more inclined to move in with friends or relatives when warmer weather makes it possible to spend less time indoors in a cramped living space. For census purposes, however, it is important to note that none of the resident women I encountered during my participant observation indicated that they considered friends’ or relatives’ residences “home,” or even a semi-permanent place of residence. I would thus speculate that such women might be more inclined to complete (or be counted on) a census form in a DV-related GQ than in a friend’s or relative’s individual housing unit where they consider themselves to be staying temporarily, regardless of the actual duration of the stay. Simultaneously, however, the number of women enumerated in DV-oriented GQ facilities on April 1 is likely to be less than it would be at a different time of year due to their greater likelihood of “doubling up” at a friend’s or relative’s home during the warmer spring and summer months.

5.3.4 Variability of administrative record reliability at DV-oriented GQs

Many women in both short- and long-term DV-oriented GQ facilities are from other towns, cities, counties, states or countries, as there is an elaborate network of both clandestine and publically known DV-related facilities across North America that functions like an “underground railroad” to hide women and protect them and their children from their abusers. GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” director Chloe noted in a joint meeting with the director of “Sharon’s Place,” that residents’ origins are not always accurately reflected in administrative records because directors of such facilities are dependent upon county or state funding and thus need to demonstrate that they receive only a limited number of non-residents. Although I did not find

this to be the case at GQ 1 “New Directions” or GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” when I used these facilities’ administrative records to conduct an independent count of residents, it is not inconceivable that the privilege of confidentiality regarding administrative records could be misused by directors who “over-count” the number of local residents in order to receive more money from local donors and government. This phenomenon has been well-documented in the scholarly literature on donor aid and non-profit organizations outside the U.S. (Bruno 1998; Smith 2008; Wedel 1998), although it is relatively unexplored in a North American context.

5.3.5 Restricted access to administrative records at domestic violence-oriented group quarters

When I requested administrative records from GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” in order to conduct an alternate census (to be used for a matching exercise by the Census Bureau) during my observations, director Chloe was initially adamant that it was illegal to release such information. Chloe insisted that the 1994 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and the shelter’s obligation to protect residents’ confidentiality legally prohibited them from releasing this information. She explained, “This is how federal agencies always do it, they work at cross-purposes. They want us to protect the women with the VAWA, but then they ask us for our records. I don’t know how many batterers there are in the Census Bureau. I don’t know how this data will be used.” Chloe later changed her mind when I assured her that the Census Bureau was legally obligated to protect such Title 13 data and that providing it would allow populations like those at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” to be better enumerated in the future. Nonetheless, she demonstrated an impressive resolve in initially refusing me access to the administrative records, insisting at one point that “I will go to federal prison before I give anybody those records. And then you can come visit me there.” The compromise we reached involved Chloe’s provision of residents’ birthdates, room numbers, race, ethnicity and number of children, which proved adequate for the construction of an alternate roster through my observations.

GQ 1 “New Directions” also provided this limited amount of resident information after learning that GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” director Chloe had consented to providing it as well. GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” director Juanita refused access to records citing the same 1994 VAWA provisions mentioned by Chloe.

5.3.6 Staff members’ negative experiences with the 2010 Census decennial operation at domestic violence-oriented group quarters

In conversations I overheard between staff members during my participant observation, all staff members at the three DV-oriented GQs in my study characterized their experiences with the 2010 Census enumeration as negative despite their desire to cooperate. This was in sharp contrast to the positive experience of GQ 4 “Base One.” GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” director Chloe explained that part of her staff’s frustration stemmed from the fact that her facility’s contacts with the census had not been what she termed “meaningful and singular.” She laughed in an exasperated manner as she contrasted what, in her view, should be a simple exercise with her actual experience of the 2010 enumeration, noting that such a streamlined experience would translate into something like the following in practice:

...somebody comes once, hands you the forms, tells you what you’re supposed to do and knows what you are supposed to do and what your special circumstances are and goes

away (laughs), you know? We collect them, they come back and take them or we mail them or whatever it is and whatever has to be done- it just seemed like all these multiple visits and multiple people, all of whom had different notions of what was supposed to happen and very little knowledge of us. I mean, we had somebody (a census worker) who I had this endless conversation with because he didn't think that he could come here, and no matter how many times I said to him, "we let men in the building" (uses comically, deliberately slow voice), he had to go on and on and on and on and on about it, that you know "men can't come into this building" and I would say "it's not true, men can come into this building" and he'd say, "well, I'll go talk to my supervisor" and I'd say "you don't have to talk to your supervisor, if you come to this building, I will let you in" (laughs). And he wouldn't come. So that was another worthless conversation that I had because then somebody else was sent. And it was, it was a waste of my time.

The kind of frustration Chloe evinced was compounded by a pre-existing culture of mistrust toward government agencies at domestic violence-oriented GQ facilities. GQ 1 "New Directions" site manager Tyler characterized this wariness when he noted "you want to trust and believe the government is going to protect that information...(but) there's enough corruption that you see and hear about that believing that is only going to carry so much weight versus what you hear and see."

5.4 Enumeration observation results

I observed the census enumeration at one of the DV-oriented GQ facilities in my ethnographic study. The first took place on March 30 at GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter," and the second occurred on April 1 at GQ 4 "Base One." Residents at the three group home facilities for women (GQ 1 "New Directions," GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter" and GQ 3 "Safe Harbor") are supposed to be enumerated by filling out an Individual Census Report. A copy of the ICR can be accessed at <http://2010.census.gov/campus/pdf/IndividualCensusReport.pdf>. As these three GQ sites differ significantly, I discuss them separately in the following assessments of my observations and discussions of the factors affecting the quality and extent of the enumerator's access to each type of institutional facility, to its residents, and to specific types of information. According to the staff of GQ 1 "New Directions," the facility did not receive a visit from an enumerator or any ICR forms during the census data collection period. This was particularly frustrating for GQ 1 "New Directions" site manager Tyler, who met with two Census Bureau workers on two separate occasions in November 2009 and February 2010. GQ 1 "New Directions" resident Keisha, who was supporting her two young children through her temporary work as a census enumerator, was especially disappointed by this, and told a GQ staff member, "It's like they're saying that we all don't count." One of the central reasons that staff members at DV-oriented GQs so strongly resented the multiple census-related contacts they received was because their schedules leave no additional room for activities unrelated to residents' everyday survival. GQ 1 "New Directions" features an environment of constant activity that allows very little time for staff members to concentrate on any single task for very long.

5.4.1 Observation of the enumeration and instances of response at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter”

I observed the enumeration at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” staff preparations for the enumeration, and had a lengthy post-enumeration conversation with the facility’s census point of contact immediately after the enumerator left. Angela, the staff point of contact for the enumeration, was visibly frustrated about what she regarded as the unnecessarily time-consuming nature of the census enumeration. “Personally,” she said, “I can’t wait until this whole process is over, because I’m the point of contact and it’s just been nonstop. I feel harassed.” Angela’s first contact with a census worker took place in February when Patty, supervisor to a number of area enumerators, arrived unannounced at a particularly stressful staff meeting to schedule the enumeration appointment for March 30. This was not appreciated by staff members, who nonetheless interrupted their meeting in order to respond to Patty. To be fair, Angela’s frustration with the census-related time burden also stemmed from the large amount of information that she, as the census point of contact, received regarding how DV-oriented GQ facilities can protect their residents’ confidentiality while complying with the requirements of the census. Such information arrived from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women, the State Coalition Against Domestic Violence, the National Organization for Women, and the National Network to End Domestic Violence. The ironic product of Angela’s careful attention to all of this information was that she was far better-prepared for the enumeration than the enumerator who visited the facility on March 30.

The enumeration itself was not well carried out. The enumerator: (1) was unsure of whether the ICR forms should be completed on March 30, 31 or April 1; (2) did not know if the ICR form distributed at the facility was different from the ICR form distributed to private individual residences; (3) did not know whether children needed to complete a separate form (or whether they should be counted at all); (4) refused to provide extra ICR forms for individuals that the facility’s census point of contact was certain were arriving that night; (5) had no clear answer for the census point of contact regarding how GQ residents should respond to question six, regarding usual place of residence; (6) did not provide enough ICR forms for residents who were in the facility on March 30 until the census point of contact specifically asked her for additional forms for those residents, and (7) refused to provide the census point of contact with a phone number to call in case other residents arrived and needed ICR forms. On three separate occasions, the enumerator deliberately ignored the census point of contact’s questions because she did not know the answers. When Angela persisted with her questions, the enumerator called her supervisor and, in both instances, confirmed that Angela was indeed correct.

Staff members at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” clearly informed the four individuals who were in residence at the time of the enumeration that they were under no obligation to complete the ICR form. This approach, which prioritizes GQ residents’ abilities to choose, probably increases the possibility of resident non-compliance, especially when compounded by the cultural factors described in the next section (“Primary factors affecting the quality and extent of enumerator access to GQ 2”). All of the residents at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” tucked the ICR form into a purse or other item soon after receiving it (and a verbal statement from GQ staff on its non-mandatory nature) from GQ staff members and census point of contact Angela. For this reason, I did not observe any instances of residents completing an ICR form at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter.”

5.4.2 Primary factors affecting the quality and extent of enumerator access to domestic violence-oriented group quarters

My observations have identified six primary factors that may have limited the quality and extent of the enumerator's access to GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter": (1) legal restrictions on resident confidentiality and release of information; (2) trust issues among staff and residents in DV-oriented GQs; (3) social services fatigue among staff and residents at DV-oriented GQs; (4) organizational philosophies in DV-oriented GQ facilities; (5) frequency of mental illness and varying stages of addiction recovery among DV-oriented GQ facility residents; and (6) literacy among residents.

Resident confidentiality is paramount at all three of the DV-oriented GQ facilities featured in my study, and this concern with confidentiality is sometimes extreme enough to prove counterproductive for staff members and residents. This is particularly relevant for DV-oriented GQ facilities. For example, if a resident at GQ 1 "New Directions" casually asks a staff member if she has seen another resident lately, the staff member is rule-bound to reply, "I can't confirm or deny whether she lives here," even if the residents live next door to one another and are close friends. This need to protect resident confidentiality is especially frustrating to social service providers and to children's teachers, who frequently call the facility with urgent requests to speak to a resident. A related example can be found in the requirement for residents at all three DV-oriented GQ facilities in my study to sign forms regarding the release of information every fifteen days. One of the first things new residents must do at GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter" is sign a form which reads "This is a confidential program for women in danger and by signing this you agree to never disclose the names of women and children staying in shelter or using shelter services."

These legal concerns regarding confidentiality prohibit the enumerator from accessing administrative records, speaking directly to residents, or even providing the ICR form to residents in person. This is related to the pervasive trust issues among staff and residents at DV-oriented GQs. As GQ 1 "New Directions" staff member Clarissa put it, "Women here will always see any kind of authority as a source of threat, even if that authority is in the form of a census badge." Residents and staff members at DV-oriented GQ facilities have unfortunately learned from experience that those in positions of authority do not always act in ways that ensure the safety of DV victim-survivors. Those residents who have reported their abuse to police, for example, quickly learn that individuals arrested on domestic battery charges can only be held in police custody for twelve hours, after which the prosecutor's office decides whether or not charges will be filed. I encountered residents at all three GQ facilities who described the inability of police and the courts to protect them from their abusers as a major source of mistrust. I also observed a number of children resident in these facilities that were visibly afraid of uniformed police officers, who they often associated with the removal of their father from the family unit. In one case that particularly terrified GQ 3 "Safe Harbor" residents, a judge awarded full child custody to a man who had just been released from a hospital for the criminally insane for shooting his wife in the face. The judge's reasoning was that the mother was recovering from an addiction to painkillers, which she had begun taking in order to care for her children following the surgery to reconstruct the damage to her face.

Staff and resident awareness of such realities directly impact their dealings with those in positions of authority, including census workers, who they assume are insensitive to the special needs of those at their facility. These trust issues also extend to staff members at DV-oriented

GQ facilities. All three such facilities in my study often featured a palpable sense of antagonistic dependency toward the federal agencies that fund them. Staff frequently paint a portrait of their professional lives as an uphill battle with almost all government agencies that provide funds for social services, often describing such agencies as indifferent to the suffering of residents in DV-oriented GQs. This is even further complicated by the reality that staff members' jobs often depend on the renewal of federal grants which, in turn, depend on facility compliance with federal regulations. On any given day I observed at all three facilities, staff members were engaged in discussions about how to obtain, keep or seek out the limited number of federal and state funding opportunities that allow them to remain open.

Prior to the census enumeration, staff members frequently expressed concerns about how to protect residents who were also undocumented migrants, who feared both their abuser and the threat of deportation. Staff members were notably worried that the Census Bureau would report the presence of the undocumented to the Department of Homeland Security.

Additionally, staff and residents at DV-oriented GQs indicated that they were less-inclined to complete the census form or have a great deal of patience with census workers, including the enumerator, due to social services fatigue, a condition brought on by the constant need for residents and staff to complete forms and answer questions as a condition of service provision. The environment at most DV-oriented GQs features a constant flow not only of social service providers but also of residents themselves to offices that refuse to accept forms via fax or email. Most residents (and staff who assist them) find it exhausting to keep up with all of the various social service agency forms that need to be submitted, inspections that need to be endured or undertaken in order to have basic accommodations for themselves and their children, all while maintaining or searching for low wage work and caring for several dependent children. For many such women, the census form has a low priority in their hierarchy of urgent tasks that need to be completed to ensure their family's survival.

The enumerator's access to the DV-oriented GQ facilities in my study was also impacted by the organizational philosophies prevalent at each. These ranged from the feminist empowerment models that stress individual decision-making at GQ 1 "New Directions" to the more regimented, authoritarian structure of GQ 3 "Safe Harbor." Facility directors who advocate a more laissez-faire and less interventionist approach to managing residents are typically old enough to remember the late 1970s, when violence against women was still solely an activist issue addressed by the women's movement and victim-survivors of abuse. This is quite different from some of their younger contemporaries, who began their careers already accustomed to the professionalization of social services and increased government involvement in and regulation of what was formerly an exclusively activist domain. The organizational philosophy framing most of residents' treatment by staff members at GQ 1 "New Directions" and GQ 2 "Emergency Shelter," is staff members' oft-repeated phrase, "staff do not know what is best for clients, because they don't have to deal with the consequences." On the opposite side of the spectrum, the philosophy of more highly structured facilities like GQ 3 "Safe Harbor" assumes that residents need help and guidance because they are in an unsettled state. In such facilities, breathalyzers, drug tests and other punitive regulations are common, and can make residents feel suspect or even criminalized.

The quality of information featured on ICRs completed at DV-oriented GQs may be compromised by the frequency of mental illness and struggles with addiction among some residents. Mental illness can be difficult to identify, and many residents I observed at DV-oriented GQs who appeared outwardly "normal" occasionally made statements indicating that

they were not living in the same reality as their peers. On one occasion during my observations at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” women were having a conversation about gendered expectations for completion of housework when resident Jessie said, “I told my kangaroo, why would I be doing the dishes if I just wanted to go get high?” She then began to laugh uproariously while the others looked unsettled. While some residents have struggled with mental illness from an early age, others have developed it as a result of trauma or chemical dependency.

Drug and alcohol abuse were common features in the lives of all three DV-oriented GQs featured in this study, and quite a few of the residents were recovering addicts. Staff members frequently discussed addiction and its enduring physical and emotional scars with residents and each other, with particular reference to methamphetamine, prescription painkillers and heroin, the most common former drugs of choice among recovering residents. For instance, GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” staff member Cheyenne noted that the cramped living quarters of the facility were further complicated by “women’s varying degrees of mental illness or addiction,” adding, “We get a lot of women who think, ‘how I get messed up (intoxicated or high) is the only thing in my life I can control’.” Among such residents, completion of the ICR form is a low priority.

A final potential hurdle influencing the quality of the information provided by residents in DV-oriented GQ facilities is inadequate levels of literacy. Cheyenne cited this as a significant problem for residents with respect to the census and said, “Quite a few residents have limited literacy. This is a major issue for residents... You never know with most people, because they can hide it very well.” The ability of residents to conceal their limited literacy from GQ staff does not bode well for the completion of the ICR form.

5.5 Semi-structured interview results

I conducted twelve post-enumeration semi-structured interviews with staff members at all three four of the DV-related GQ facilities featured. I used neutral questions designed to elicit responses grouped into four thematic areas: (1) interviewees’ previous experiences with the Census Bureau; (2) interviewees’ perceptions of the 2010 Census form; (3) interviewees’ impressions of the 2010 enumeration process; (4) interviewees’ understandings of the mode of information collection. Including a brief introduction on confidentiality and a debriefing, each interview lasted approximately one hour. Questions grouped into these four thematic areas generated seven key themes, many of which recurred across GQ facility types. These key themes were: (1) awareness of the Census’ importance; (2) respondents’ desire for expanded racial and ethnic categories; (3) staff frustration with lack of enumerator/census worker knowledge and preparedness; (4) surprise at the limited number of questions on the ICR/MCR form; (5) concerns about confidentiality and data stewardship; (6) time-consuming nature of multiple census-related contacts; (7) “census mystique,” a phenomenon in which respondents were unsure of the census’ scope, abilities and purpose.

5.5.1 Awareness of the importance of the Census

The staff members who I interviewed frequently made unsolicited comments regarding their understanding of the census as an important and essential tool for measuring the population and allocating resources. Quite a few respondents mentioned the need for the Census Bureau to dispel fears about how census data are used, particularly amongst undocumented migrants

resident in the United States. Interviewees also mentioned misgivings among the public regarding the use of census data. GQ 1 “New Directions” staff member La Tanya drew upon her previous experiences as an enumerator in Census 2000 to observe that when she worked for the Census Bureau, “some people were afraid to give their information. They felt like it might be used for purposes other than just to count, you know, even though you try to explain to them...that’s not what this is about, they still wonder.”

5.5.2 Desire for expanded racial and ethnic categories at domestic violence-oriented group quarters

Interviewees of all racial and ethnic backgrounds indicated the need for the expansion or clarification on the questions regarding race and ethnicity. GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” director Juanita wondered why the ICR form did not have a category for what she termed “people of Middle Eastern descent.”

5.5.3 Frustration with Census worker/enumerator lack of training and preparedness

Several staff members, particularly at DV-oriented GQ facilities, expressed frustration regarding a lack of training and preparedness among enumerators or census workers. GQ 1 “New Directions” site manager Tyler was dismayed at how difficult and time-consuming the process of classifying this facility was for the census worker with whom he met. Tyler drew upon his previous experiences as a census enumerator to contrast what he viewed as the inefficient manner in which a census worker interacted with him, through what he regarded as no fault of her own, as she asked him questions designed to classify the GQ facility’s type. After describing his own perceptions of the difficulties faced by enumerators, he explained:

...I don’t think that she could have done much different than she did. I mean, she doesn’t design the questionnaire and my guess is that she doesn’t have a hand in determining how places like ours get counted so I think that she probably did exactly what she was supposed to. Really I think that it needs to be changed at a higher level...I remember that when I was an enumerator, you do have to really be almost obsequious and you almost have to be that way to a fault, because you’re so glad to get somebody who will take the time to do it. It wasn’t done deftly, it took awhile, a lot of flipping back and forth, and when she left, I just didn’t really feel like, “okay, she got us,” you know? Or that we got counted the way we should have been, it was just sort of the best of two less than perfect ways that we could have been counted.

Tyler’s sensitivity to the census worker’s difficulties in working with a rather inflexible set of categories indicates the need for changes in how some GQs are classified, a topic discussed elsewhere in this report. Clearly, however, the census worker could have been better-prepared and more familiar with the categories for classification.

This concern about census workers’ and enumerators’ lack of training and preparedness was echoed by GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” director Juanita and GQ 1 “New Directions” staff member La Tanya. Juanita recommended that enumerators and census workers be provided with a short list of key issues unique to DV-related GQ facilities, particularly the fact that federal law mandates the protection of residents’ confidentiality. Staff members at all three GQ facilities for women expressed concern regarding the fact that they were more aware of these laws as they applied to the census than were the enumerators and census workers who visited their facilities.

As Juanita explained, when such untrained individuals arrive from the Census Bureau, “the tendency is to just kind of want to shut the door and say, you know, we can’t help you then.”

5.5.4 Staff concerns about confidentiality and data stewardship

Some staff members at DV-oriented GQs expressed concern about the Census Bureau’s ability to safeguard data and protect confidentiality. GQ 1 “New Directions” site manager Tyler, like a few other respondents, expressed concerns that some individuals might fail to complete the census form due to their fears that the data might be used for potentially damaging purposes, such as deportation or arrest. Tyler explained that “I would be more convinced about the whole confidentiality issue if I knew...what measures they take to ensure that happens.” He recommended adding a line on the census form to indicate the legal penalties for violating confidentiality or misusing census data. This, he felt, would reassure reluctant participants that serious consequences await those who mishandle or otherwise abuse census data.

GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” director Chloe described the form as “very bare bones...not asking for very much information” and expressed hope that “some sort of follow-up study would be conducted to gather additional demographic data. On a related note, GQ 1 “New Directions” staff members La Tanya observed that it might be helpful for the Census Bureau to explore what she termed “a tasteful way” to gather information about the number of people who were living in subsidized housing. She added that doing so would be an extremely expedient way to “funnel money into that population.”

5.5.5 Time-consuming nature of multiple census-related contacts

Several interviewees commented on the time-consuming nature of receiving multiple census-related contacts. GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” director Chloe complained that she felt “harassed” by the Census Bureau due to what she perceived as a heavy time burden placed upon GQ staff members by census workers and the enumerator who visited the facility. She characterized her experience with the 2010 enumeration as follows:

...I’ve been feeling harassed by the census because it started months ago. Somebody called me up, I gave this person twenty minutes, somebody else called me up, I gave this person twenty minutes. There didn’t seem to be any connection between the first person and the second person. You know, since then it’s been sort of person after person and them making connections with other staff members and...Person B has no idea what Person A has said and gives you different information and Person C doesn’t know about A and B. You know I am a big defender of the census and want very much to participate and cooperate, but I think they made it very difficult.

GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” staff member and census point of contact Angela concurred, noting, “The whole process could have been like this (snaps her fingers). They should have one person from the Census Bureau call the point of contact and give clear, consistent information...This is such a simple process and they’re making it like it’s brain surgery.”

5.5.6 “Census mystique” and lack of clarity regarding its scope, purpose and abilities at DV-oriented GQs

Some interviewees evinced something I term “census mystique,” a phenomenon in which individuals are uncertain of the Census Bureau’s scope and abilities. Naming this recurring sentiment helps to explain some interviewees’ confusion regarding particular issues. GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” director Chloe, for example, was concerned about the source of census-related data that was not requested on the 2010 ICR and had, according to her, been present on previous ICR forms in previous decennials. Chloe said:

...because I work on data reports for a city commission, we have turned to the census on numerous occasions for information...all kinds of information that we, my husband and I, were not asked about our household, so I’m wondering if the census is going to be as useful for that purpose as the 2000 and 1990 (Census)...It seemed to me that there was all kinds of information about occupation and income that wasn’t in this questionnaire at all.

This “census mystique” took on an exasperated tone at DV-oriented GQs that experienced improperly carried out or severely delayed enumerations. GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” director Juanita and GQ 1 “New Directions” site manager Tyler both noted their frustration at having spent valuable time during staff meetings discussing the census and then not receiving any census forms at all (in the case of GQ 1) or not receiving any census forms until six weeks after the April 1 enumeration (in the case of GQ 3). For Juanita, this frustration was compounded when a census worker finally came to the facility in the third week of May to drop off ICR forms and made it very clear to Juanita that these should only be distributed to residents who had been in the facility on April 1. When Juanita told the census worker, “That doesn’t make any sense, because some of them aren’t here anymore,” the census worker replied that she was very busy and finding it difficult to distribute ICRs to all the facilities that needed them by April 1. Juanita told me that the census worker instructed her to have residents who were in the facility on April 1 complete the form, which effectively ignored all residents who were living there on April 1 and had left by the time that the enumeration actually took place in May.

5.6 Independent enumeration results

For my independent enumeration, I obtained administrative records with residents’ birthdates, room numbers, number of co-resident children, and racial/ethnic information from GQ 1 “New Directions” and GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter.” I used these administrative records to create a list of residents who were staying at these facilities on April 1, 2010 during my usual observation. Although the records did not use names, it was fairly simple to identify residents using the information on age, race and number of children. Obtaining the administrative records from GQ 1 “New Directions” and GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” proved quite a difficult exercise despite the excellent rapport I had developed with staff members at both facilities. My request for administrative records containing residents’ names, birthdates, race and ethnicity was initially refused by Chloe, the director of these facilities, on the grounds that releasing this information to me and, by default, the Census Bureau, would constitute a violation of the confidentiality laws embedded in the 1994 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Chloe was adamant that she could not release women’s names, noting, “This is how federal agencies always do it, they work at cross-purposes. They want to protect the women with the VAWA but then they ask us for our records. I don’t know how many batterers are in the Census Bureau. I don’t know how these

records will be used.” Although Chloe later changed her mind and did provide me with residents’ birthdates, room numbers, number of co-resident children and racial and ethnic information from the administrative records at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” she insisted when I first asked, “I will go to federal prison before I give anybody those records. And then you can come visit me there.” This kind of missionary-like zeal is common among many individuals who work in such GQs, and is discussed in greater depth in my “Fieldnotes Summary Report.”

Although my independent enumeration was accurate at both facilities, I would strongly caution against discounting the possibility of the “hidden resident” phenomenon at GQ 1 “New Directions,” where residents’ living spaces are private and off-limits in the form of locked doors to private rooms. This phenomenon, in which individuals are not enumerated in complex or ambiguous households for a variety of socioeconomic reasons, has been well-documented by Census Bureau researchers (Martin & de la Puente 1993; de la Puente 1993). Despite the exact match between administrative records and my own enumeration via observation of the residents present in the facility on April 1, this was not always the case on other occasions I observed. This potential for “hidden residents” was possible at GQ 1 “New Directions” because the sign-in system for guests was extremely haphazard and staff members rarely checked to verify that a guest had in fact left the building by the end of the day. The busy nature of the facility and its overburdened staff members created many opportunities for women to allow visitors, including men, to stay overnight in their apartments, even though this was explicitly against the facility’s rules. I noted four separate occasions in which male visitors were signed in by resident women but did not leave by the time visiting hours were over, although women had changed the sign-in log to indicate that the men had left. As I did not interact with these men, it is impossible for me to speculate whether they were homeless or had their own residences where they may have been enumerated. However, their presence indicates just how fluid and even circular in nature the GQ population is, as it is hardly inconceivable that someone could leave the military (or prison, or any number of other GQ facilities) and end up secretly living for a brief period of time in a facility like GQ 1 “New Directions,” where staff members are too busy to closely monitor the sign-in log.

5.7 Summary: Primary Social Dynamics Likely to Impact Census Coverage Measurement

This ethnographic study identified seven social and contextual aspects that may have impacted the accuracy of the 2010 Census enumeration at DV-oriented GQs: (1) gradual shift from the activist to the professionalized sphere; (2) complexity of living arrangements; (3) social services fatigue; (4) emotionally fraught nature of everyday life; (5) impact of trauma; (6) frequency of mental illness and addiction recovery; (7) problems with literacy. Related to these are four primary social dynamics likely to impact the implementation of a CCM study: (1) recent negative experiences with the 2010 enumeration; (2) seasonal variations in population levels; (3) restricted access to administrative records; (4) variability of administrative record reliability. Recent negative experiences with the 2010 enumeration stemmed from staff frustration with multiple census-related contacts, lack of enumerator sensitivity and/or preparedness and, in some cases, the failure to enumerate. Reduced staff cooperation is a possible implication of this frustration that could impact CCM. Seasonal variations in population levels are also likely to impact CCM, as such facilities reach their maximum capacity in the cold weather months, when individuals must spend more time indoors. These facilities experience their lowest level of

occupancy in April and May, when the school year is nearing its end, making women less likely to disrupt their children's schedules, and warmer weather makes it possible to spend more time outdoors while living as a guest in a friend or relative's home. As a consequence for CCM, the recapture sample will be different, as a high proportion of residents will not have been present on April 1. Restricted access to administrative records due to a culture of suspicion pervasive at such facilities will make it difficult to use such records to assess CCM. An additional implication for CCM is that these records are sometimes altered or otherwise unreliable due to the need to house women from other states or countries not covered by the facility's funders.

5.8 Recommendations for alternatives to standardized Census Coverage Measurement practices at domestic violence-oriented group quarters facilities

5.8.1 Measure existing frame coverage utilizing existing National Network to End Domestic Violence list

There are approximately 2,000 DV-oriented GQs in the United States (Iyengar & Sabik 2009: 1052). These facilities are linked together via their membership in state coalitions against domestic violence, which is an excellent resource for the Census Bureau in future research on DV-oriented GQ facilities. In its fourth annual "census" of these facilities, the National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) determined that 48,350 individuals used their services, which include crisis phone calls and counseling in addition to residency, in a randomly selected 24 hour period (NNEDV 2009a). The NNEDV maintains the most comprehensive list of DV-oriented GQ facilities, which is accessible through its website and its office in Washington, D.C. (NNEDV 2009b).

Such coordination is a relatively recent development in the United States stemming from the passage of several federal laws that changed the way that DV-oriented GQs are funded, organized and structured. The greatest change was increased centralization, including eligibility for federal funding through Family Violence Prevention Services Act, the Victims of Crime Act, and the Violence Against Women Act. Most significantly, "this complex, multi-agency funding structure has led to the emergence of state domestic violence coalitions, which are federally recognized, state-level nonprofit entities that coordinate funding, training and education for federally funded domestic violence programs" (Iyengar & Sabik 2009: 1053).

I recommend that the Census Bureau make use of this relatively recent state and nationwide coordination to improve its enumeration of DV-oriented GQ facilities. The NNEDV's list of DV-oriented facilities could be used in conjunction with the Census Bureau's records on the facilities classified by census workers using the Group Quarters Validation Questionnaire as either "Type Code 801 Group Homes Intended for Adults" or "Type Code 904 Religious Group Quarters," the two categories into which DV-oriented GQ facilities are most likely to fall. From this matched list, fifty DV-oriented GQs should be randomly selected to participate in a voluntary study to assess CCM.

Notably, the creation of this matched list will serve an important ancillary function by assessing the accuracy of the current census type codes listed on the Group Quarters Validation Questionnaire. It would be especially interesting to examine whether all such self-identified DV-oriented facilities listed by the NNEDV (2009b) have in fact been classified as such by the categories available on the Group Quarters Validation Questionnaire. Such an exercise could also generate statistics on the frequency with which these facilities are misclassified by census workers who may find themselves rather limited by the categories available on this Questionnaire. As a consequence, a Census worker might classify a DV-oriented GQ facility featuring separate apartments for residents, such as GQ 1 “New Directions” or GQ 3 “Safe Harbor” as a type code 801 (group home intended for adults) rather than a type code 904 (religious group quarters and domestic violence shelters), because such facilities do not fit neatly into either category. This is problematic for several reasons: (1) it renders those women, and their children who are in fact fleeing violence in the home, invisible by misclassifying them as “group home” residents; (2) it obscures the frequency of domestic violence in the U.S. by undercounting the number of women who are actually living in DV-oriented GQ facilities; (3) such undercounting dramatically impacts researchers and funding agencies that look to the Census Bureau’s statistics for accurate information on population demographics such as the number of women in DV-oriented GQ facilities. The national trend in DV services increasingly focuses on a more holistic approach that recognizes that victim-survivors also have long-term housing needs in addition to the necessity of short-term emergency shelters (Menard 2001). This trend is likely to continue, making it all the more important that this issue be clarified prior to the next decennial census enumeration.

5.8.2 Minimization of time burden placed upon staff

All communications with DV-related GQs must be streamlined in order to facilitate their participations in CCM procedures. The lack of such efficient communication was a serious problem in all three GQ facilities for women featured in this study, and the census points of contact clearly felt frustrated that they had been asked the same information by two or more census workers. “We have life and death issues to deal with here,” one census point of contact at a DV-oriented GQ facility explained, “the Census has all kinds of taxpayer resources and should really have their act together better than this.” As was most evident in the frequent miscommunications between census workers and GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” census point of contact, there is a need for clear, consistent information to be relayed from a single census worker to a single GQ facility census point of contact. It would be ideal if this census worker could be specially trained to have a better understanding of the dynamics of everyday life at the GQ facility in which CCM was being assessed. Having a single point of contact between a single census worker and a single GQ staff member will avoid the kinds of miscommunications about dates, procedures and expectations that characterized the enumeration at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter.” Notably, GQ 4 “Base One” had only one census point of contact (the enumerator) and had an overall positive experience with the 2010 enumeration.

A letter should be sent to the 50 selected DV-oriented GQ facilities chosen as part of the CCM random sample approximately two weeks in advance of the census workers’ initial phone call. Preferably this letter will be drafted in conjunction with the Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women and will outline the choices for participating in the CCM study to ensure that the facility’s census point of contact is aware of these choices before the phone

contact takes place. Sending a letter will also reduce the possibility for miscommunication between the census worker and the census point of contact. Email would also be an acceptable form of communication, and addresses for the likely points of contact, most likely to be called site managers, office managers, or advocates, are easily obtained through each organization's website.

Streamlining such communication should begin with the first point of contact that takes place between a census worker and a GQ staff member. First impressions are significant in that they help to shape institutional perceptions of large and bureaucratic organizations like the Census Bureau. This was particularly obvious in the experience of the site manager and census point of contact at GQ 1 "New Directions," who was frustrated by the census worker's assumption that all GQ staff members were equally well-informed about highly specialized information regarding the facility. The first visit by a census worker to the facility, which took place with no advance notice in November 2009, gave the site manager and, in turn, all GQ staff members, the impression that the Census Bureau was not well-prepared for the task of classifying or enumerating facilities such as theirs.

I recommend that census workers be trained to follow a protocol for contact that prioritizes the minimization of time burden on GQ staff. The first phone call from the census worker to the facility should ascertain which staff member is the best point of contact at the facility. This could be done through a phone call, in which the census worker makes the following statement:

Hello, I'm (name) from the U.S. Census Bureau. In order to ensure that all residents at facilities like yours are counted, we are doing a follow-up study to assess how well we are doing in our efforts to count everyone. Is there anyone who works here who has previously met with a census worker about counting the residents at this facility?

After ascertaining who this point of contact is, the census worker should then request a time and date convenient for a ten-minute phone conversation, in which the census point of contact will be asked which of the options for assessing CCM (outlined in subsections below) their facility will participate. It is important for the census worker to schedule a convenient time for this conversation in order to avoid replicating what several census points of contacts at DV-oriented GQ facilities described as a lack of respect for GQ staff members' time on the part of the census worker or enumerator. During the ten-minute conversation, the census worker should outline the importance of assessing CCM at DV-oriented GQs and offer two options for participation, outlined below.

5.8.3 Recommended options for Census Coverage Measurement participation

During the scheduled ten-minute phone conversation with the census point of contact, the census worker should briefly explain the purposes of carrying out a CCM exercise and that the total time burden on the facility will be less than two hours, including all contacts from the Census Bureau. Offering three choices to census points of contact at DV-oriented GQ facilities will likely increase participation in the CCM study. Doing so indicates flexibility on the part of the Census Bureau, as well as the understanding that such facilities vary greatly in size and organizational philosophy. I recommend that DV-oriented GQ facilities be provided with the following two options for assessing CCM: (1) self-enumeration via modified, limited use of administrative records; or (2) census improvement-directed focus groups.

5.8.3.1 Self-enumeration via modified, limited use of administrative records

The level of concern regarding the protection of resident confidentiality at DV-oriented GQ facilities makes it highly unlikely that such facilities will release complete administrative records to the Census Bureau. Facilities should have the option to disclose as much or as little information as possible, as the amount of information DV-oriented GQs are willing to provide to the Census Bureau will vary based upon their organizational philosophy. Requesting a randomly-selected number of DV-oriented GQ facilities to self-enumerate using administrative records would serve several important purposes: (1) it would remove the need to request residents, many of whom have social services fatigue due to the large numbers of forms they must complete as a condition of receiving services, to provide yet more information about themselves; and (2) it would assess CCM by reducing the possibility of resident non-compliance and indicating, even if only in partial form due to concerns about respecting residents' confidentiality, the number of individuals in residence.

5.8.3.2 Census improvement-directed focus groups

It would be extremely productive and useful for the Census Bureau to commission a small group of researchers with experience in DV-oriented GQs to conduct focus groups in a randomly selected sample of approximately fifty such facilities. These focus groups would consist of GQ staff members and, if GQ staff will allow it, residents who volunteer to participate. Such focus groups would assess the experiences of DV-oriented GQs with the 2010 enumeration in different parts of the United States. These would assess perceptions of the decennial operation to determine whether there are recurring themes characterizing the experience of such facilities with the census. Focus groups would also elicit suggestions for improving future enumerations from a broader range of facilities that will indicate how prevalent the issues discussed at the three DV-oriented GQ facilities in this study are in facilities across the country.

Using experienced researchers to assess these responses in a wide variety of U.S. geographic contexts would generate common themes that need to be addressed to improve census coverage in such facilities. It would also indicate the wider prevalence of the kind of negative perceptions of the 2010 enumeration found at the three DV-oriented facilities featured in this study. It would be particularly useful if the findings discussed in this report were pursued further in focus group discussions to assess their applicability to DV-oriented facilities throughout the United States.

5.8.4 Brief note on the need for legal clarification regarding confidentiality

The most significant area of confusion regarding the 2010 Census at DV-oriented GQs surrounded the question of such facilities' responsibility to protect residents' confidentiality. I highly recommend that the Census Bureau further explore this issue prior to conducting any CCM exercises, particularly in the area of legal means by which the Census Bureau could persuade DV-oriented GQ facilities to share their administrative records. This research would also apply to other GQ facilities that feature a high degree of legal protection of residents' confidentiality, including residential drug and alcohol treatment facilities, and psychiatric institutions.

5.9 Recommendations for further research on group homes for women

All of the staff members at DV-oriented GQs featured in this study applauded the Census Bureau's interest in improving its efforts to enumerate this population of women. Many staff members expressed the view that not counting such women had serious implications for poverty assistance measures, as well as their own social services work. As such, I have identified four areas for future research that will help to illuminate the social realities that help to shape the residence identities of low income women and their families.

5.9.1 Residence patterns of women leaving DV-oriented GQs

Such research would benefit from a longitudinal study over the course of a year, and could be combined with a study of women leaving prison and drug rehabilitation centers. This study could identify the factors that inform women's decisions regarding their place of residence after leaving a GQ facility. This study should explicitly address race and ethnicity as significant points of enquiry to identify if common themes emerge across groups regarding women's post-GQ residence. This would help to address the "differential net undercount of blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans" (Bell & Cohen 2009: 23). Quite likely this under-coverage is even more dramatic among women of color who have experienced intimate partner violence.

5.9.2 Residence identity among women using drop-in centers for street sex workers and addicts

Very little is known about this population of women due to the limited amount of scholarly research available on the topic (Gilchrist et al. 2001; Romero-Daza, Weeks & Singer 2003). Drop-in centers are non-residential facilities that offer services without appointment and typically without charge to a particular population. Such services may include minor medical treatment, condoms and health information. Such centers do not accommodate residents overnight, yet provide a meeting point for many precariously-housed individuals and those who provide services to them. Drop-in centers vary in their mission and purpose, but often cater to street sex workers, a number of whom are also addicts. These women are unlikely to go to a homeless shelter because they cannot pass random drug/alcohol testing, and are unlikely to go to a DV-oriented GQ because they are not ready to comply with the numerous rules at such facilities. A longitudinal study would be ideal, and would assess women's origin of displacement, and their notions of residence identity.

5.9.3 Notions of residence identity in low income female-headed households.

This would be particularly useful to carry out in Section 8 public housing facilities where the number of adult male residents is far exceeded by the number of women and children. It would be especially useful to explore these women's understandings and definitions of family/household groups to arrive at a better understanding of how they could receive improved census coverage. This study could examine the construction of fictive kinship, understandings of household membership, and networks of support among low income female-headed households.

It would be extremely interesting to trace the daily residence patterns of such women and their children over the course of a year to determine the fluidity of their residence identities.

5.9.4 Residence patterns among minors in group quarters facilities and shared custody arrangements

Findings from this study show that there was a marked incidence of children with multiple residences at longer-term DV-oriented GQ facilities in this study. It would be useful to measure the frequency with which children are doubly counted using a matching exercise. This exercise could begin with children listed on forms completed by individuals in GQ facilities and then search for incidences of duplication on independent household forms. Such a study is not necessarily limited to GQ facilities, and could also apply to situations of joint custody and female-headed households.

6 Study Two: Military Group Quarters

6.1 Literature review: Military group quarters

The scholarly literature on military facilities is relatively limited. However, it is clear that the populations living in military GQs are proud men and women serving our country who have no reason to remain anonymous. The rather limited social science literature on the military documents that individuals housed in military GQs often do not consider themselves “residents” of the location where they are enumerated because they are stationed there only temporarily for training, transfer or deployment (Hollman 1998). As the ensuing report documents, residents at military GQs are at a high risk for duplicate count due to the mandatory nature of completing the MCR at military GQs. This stems from the universality of extreme hierarchy at military GQs (Brasset 1997; Hawkins 2005; Ingraham 1983; Katz 1990) and cultural norms stressing obedience toward superior officers (Ben-Ari 1998; Dorn & Graves 2000; Frese 2003; Hawkins 2001; Lutz 2002a, 2002b; Simons 1999, 1997). Other factors that may play a role include troops’ racial and ethnic diversity (Armor 1996; D’Amico 1997; Fujimura 2003, 1999; Mershon & Schlossman 1998), dynamics unique to military families (Adams 1997; Biank 2007; Harrell 2003, 2000; Harrison & Laliberte 1997), gender relations in the military (Baldwin & Rothwell 1993; Becraft 1992; Benedict 2009; Enloe 2000; Feinman 2000; Fenner 2001; Peach 1997; Sadler 1997; Stiehm 1996; Ziegler & Gunderson 2005), and special health or psychological issues that take on unique forms in the military (Hoge et al. 2006; McNulty 2000; Meola 1997; Guillemain 2003). Military bases form a society quite separate from the world outside their gates (Dorn & Graves 2000; Frese 2003; Hawkins 2001; Ingraham 1984; Lutz 2002a; Lutz 2002b; Simons 1999).

Interestingly, academic researchers have also found parallels between men’s military enlistment and multiple residences among women and children. In her classic ethnography of a poor and working class urban neighborhood, anthropologist Ida Susser observed that when men enlisted in the military during periods of high unemployment, women and their children would often move in with relatives until the men returned as part of a situation in which “financial need was combined with child care problems or a desire for companionship” (Susser 1982: 153).

6.2 Background on “Base One” (GQ 4)

The military facility, GQ 4 “Base One,” is a military barracks located in a rural area of the Midwest. It houses a maximum of 4,000 residents prior to their deployment, although during the period of my research this number tended to average between 200 and 500 residents. This facility is a military barracks located in a remote rural area of the Midwest. It houses a maximum of 4,000 residents, although during my observations this number tended to average between 200 and 500 residents. Military vehicles and visitors alike enter the facility through a single gate under armed guard, and must present identification, which is thoroughly examined by a uniformed soldier before the visitor is permitted to proceed. Upon gaining entry, the visitor is struck by the desolate nature of the facility’s dirt roads that connect the plastic-sided trailers with other, more permanent structures such as the headquarters building, dining facility, the counterinsurgency training center, the All Ranks Club and several nationally-known fast food restaurants. Civilian vehicles clearly stand out among various forms of military transport, including tanks, Hummers and jeeps driven by young men and, less frequently, young women. The only signs that mark the generally empty streets warn “Shooting Range” or “Complacency Kills,” the latter of which is often accompanied by a very vivid photograph of a wrecked and overturned Hummer in the desert. Certain areas of GQ 4 “Base One” are designed to simulate the conditions troops will encounter in Iraq and Afghanistan, featuring a desert landscape complete with brown and dark green camouflage tents in the sand. When a visitor to this facility does encounter others in the wide expanse of this military installation, it is usually in the form of a group of uniformed men and women walking down the road in full desert combat gear. Occasionally one will encounter a lone soldier walking slowly down the dirt road near the shooting range, automatic weapon hanging loosely by its strap from his shoulder.

The headquarters building is located at the center of GQ 4 “Base One” almost as if it were the nucleus of a cell. Despite the prevalence of dirt and dust on the roads throughout the facility, everything inside this building is immaculately clean. Uniformed officers walk with a sense of urgency and purpose inside this building, which is decorated with military artwork commemorating various battles involving U.S. troops. The waiting area features a large, gold-framed oil painting titled “Avengers of Bataan,” in which a group of U.S. soldiers warily eye a smoky bombed area in the distance. A large seal immediately opposite the glass front door bears the base’s logo and the year of its founding. Copies of the military magazines are shelved on the wall next to Visitor’s Guides for the Midwestern region and a list of motels in a nearby town. A glass case features a certification of registration with the state Department of Labor, as well as medals and insignia from military operations units formerly stationed at GQ 4 “Base One” carried out in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo.

Most of the buildings inside GQ 4 “Base 1” are multipurpose, and in the warmer spring months of my later observations, huge industrial fans made a constant whirl in the background of larger buildings. Several of these multipurpose buildings feature full institutional kitchens in the back, as well as portable film screens arrayed in front of the room at an angle. The furniture arrangements in these multipurpose buildings are provisional and feature an odd assortment of portable cafeteria tables, dusty couches, and carts loaded with granola bars and soda. All of these multipurpose buildings can be quickly rearranged to suit a variety of purposes, including meetings, training exercises and, as I observed in April, the census enumeration.

As is the case at GQ 1 “New Directions,” GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter” and GQ 3 “Safe Harbor,” an environment of constant motion characterizes everyday life at GQ 4 “Base One.”

Even when officers and troops are seated, they busy themselves text messaging, talking to loved ones on their mobile phones or, in some cases, reading. Sitting and idly chatting is frowned upon and various forms of social control, particular joking, serve to convey this message quite clearly to officers and enlisted troops. One such instance took place as I sat with an officer while waiting to conduct a post-enumeration semi-structured interview. Other officers quickly approached him and began to tease him by asking “Hey, you decommissioning?” by way of commenting on his atypically restful posture. The interior walls of most of these multipurpose buildings feature a small plaque that lists ten military points of contact in case of emergency at GQ 4 “Base One,” and the largest, boldest letters on the plaque read “Do Not Call 911.” These small things, along with the obvious isolation that characterizes everyday life at GQ 4 “Base One” are constant reminders of the uniquely independent nature of military facilities.

6.3 Methods employed

In addition to conducting participant observation and semi-structured interviews, I spent the entire day of the April 1 enumeration at GQ 4 “Base One,” which allowed me to engage in unobtrusive observation of officers’ preparations for the enumeration as well as approximately one and a half hours of discussion with officers and troops immediately following the enumeration. These officers knew me well from my previous observations at the base, and I easily developed a rapport with soldiers due to our common experiences living with military families.

6.4 Participant observation results

I spent 22 hours observing at this facility on four separate occasions, including three full days before the enumeration took place (for a total of 28 hours) and the entire day of the census enumeration on April 1. My time at GQ 4 “Base One” was considerably more limited than I would have liked it to be due to security concerns and the need for me to be escorted by an officer during the vast majority of my time on base. Although I could be mistaken for a staff member, volunteer or, very occasionally, a resident at the three DV-oriented GQ facilities for women in my study, I was conspicuous at GQ 4 “Base One” because I was not wearing a uniform. Nonetheless, my gender and petite stature often made officers and soldiers strike up conversations with me that shed light on their views regarding everyday life at GQ 4 “Base One.”

Like most military installations, this facility is a place of extreme hierarchy governed by elaborate sets of written rules and codes as well as informal means of differentiating between different ranks (Brasset 1997; Katz 1990). For instance, it is often quite obvious to most individuals who have spent time on military bases which branch of the armed forces a person is from without even looking at the uniforms and rank insignia worn by that person. Most of the officers and troops I spoke with at GQ 4 “Base One” clearly stated that members of the Marine Corps, for example, carry themselves very differently from individuals enlisted in the National Guard. An elaborate set of rules governs interactions between officers and enlisted troops, who are not supposed to socialize with one another because it might lead to nepotism, and are forbidden from dating either above or below their rank for the same reason. Distinctions between members of the military and civilians even more extreme and clear-cut; as one officer noted, “People would rather deal with me in uniform than the person sitting next to me in civilian clothes. It’s weird, but I feel different in civilian clothes, I’m less comfortable.”

This civilian/military hierarchy was most evident at GQ 4 “Base One” between contractors, enlisted soldiers, officers and legal advisors. Accordingly, I divided my time between these four groups of individuals in a variety of settings, including observing officers planning troop activities for the next day, dining with troops preparing to deploy to Iraq, and visiting with contractors and legal advisors. On a typical day, I would accompany an officer to several different multipurpose buildings on at GQ 4 “Base One” to observe activities as the units in residence prepared for their deployment.

6.4.1 Complexity of individual residence identities at military barracks

It is thus rather problematic that the category “Usual Housing Elsewhere” (UHE) is not allowed on the MCR form. At GQ 4 “Base One,” troops were clearly eager to “get on with the mission” and leave the facility for deployment in an active conflict zone. In military facilities such as GQ 4 “Base One,” troops may be housed at the facility for as little as three weeks prior to deployment. This provoked an enormous amount of confusion for the two military units that had arrived at the facility just four days prior to the April 1 census enumeration. Due to the proximity of the enumeration to their relocation from home, quite a few of these individuals had already completed an ICR form at their usual place of residence. This is particularly applicable to members of the National Guard, who work in civilian jobs prior to and after their mobilization and yet make up close to half of troops stationed in Iraq (Polusny et al. 2009: 353).

Most notably, I did not encounter a single individual at any of the four GQs that characterized the facility as their “home” in their discussions with staff members or other residents.

6.4.2 Restricted access to administrative records

A high level of concern regarding resident confidentiality exists at GQ 4 “Base One.” I was surprised to learn during one of my visits that even those who work at the facility do not have access to administrative records containing the names and other identifying information of troops stationed there. These records remain with each military unit commander prior to and after deployment. The unit commanders I spoke with at GQ 4 “Base One” were adamant that these records are not accessible under any circumstances.

6.4.3 Culturally insular and security-oriented nature of military group quarters

This civilian/military hierarchy was most evident at GQ 4 “Base One” between contractors, enlisted soldiers, officers and legal advisors. My civilian status initially complicated access to the GQ 4 “Base One,” and it took several weeks before the office of the military Judge Advocate General (JAG) in another state issued permission for me to observe at the facility. My request to observe at the facility was only presented to JAG because the Post Commander at the facility was supportive of this census study. I also sought observational access to two other military facilities and was refused due to security concerns expressed by senior officers.

6.4.4 Enumeration observation results

Individuals who are resident at the military GQ facility are enumerated using a Military Census Report (MCR). The April 1 enumeration I observed at GQ 4 “Base One” was extremely efficiently conducted, with officers clearly instructing batches of troops on how to complete the MCR form. The military experience with the 2010 Census enumeration was by far the most positive of the four GQs covered in this study, which is largely due to the fact that military populations are accustomed to following orders from their superiors who, in turn, are accustomed to cooperating with government agencies in a harmonious fashion. This organizational aspect of military culture compensated for the fact that the census point of contact at GQ 4 “Base One” changed three times, from a Captain to a Sergeant to a Lieutenant, between mid-March and the April 1, and yet the experience was largely characterized as a good one by all concerned at the facility.

The only point of complaint regarding preparations for the census came from Lieutenant White, who was the census point of contact at GQ 4 Base One. Lieutenant White estimated that he spent a total of 14 hours preparing for the enumeration, including eight hours spent compiling 180 individual MCR packets for the two military units in residence at the time of the enumeration, four hours meeting with the enumerator the evening before the enumeration discussing how to prepare the forms, and approximately two hours in phone conversations with the enumerator and the Captain and Sergeant who passed the task on to him. Lieutenant White suggested that this time could have been dramatically reduced if the MCR packets were prepared in advance by an enumerator or census worker.

During the enumeration, the enumerator stood silently in the back of the building as the unit commanders instructed troops to fill out the MCR forms. This was unfortunate in that quite a few soldiers had questions regarding the over-count of some residents who had already filled out an ICR form at their individual homes prior to deployment, or regarding the “Other” option under the categories of race and ethnicity. It is unfair to expect the GQ staff to understand the nuances of the census process, and future enumerators should be trained to speak up and correct inappropriate information or instructions given by GQ staff members to residents during the course of a “self-enumeration.” The entire enumeration of 180 troops lasted approximately one and a half hours, and I spent about the same amount of time conducting post-enumeration semi-structured interviews immediately after all of the MCR forms were completed.

Due to the 100 percent compliance rate in completing the MCR forms, the most commonly expressed concern by troops while completing the form dealt with over-counting. Many of the troops stationed at GQ 4 “Base One” had arrived just a few days prior to the enumeration and had already completed an ICR (HU form) at home prior to deployment or were listed as a member of another household. The two unit commanders that troops asked about this both replied that everyone had to complete the MCR regardless of whether they had already completed the ICR. In one instance, a unit commander convinced a reluctant soldier who had already completed his ICR form, which is only for un-enlisted individuals, at home prior to deployment to also fill out the MCR form by sharply stating, “It’s a federal law. You’ll go to prison if you don’t fill it out.”

The two unit commanders were rather dismissive of individual soldiers’ questions at several points as troops completed their census forms. In one case, a young female soldier was visibly angry because “Chicana” was not a listed option on the MCR form, although “Chicano” was, leading her to inform the unit commander, “I’m not Chicano, I’m Chicana- I don’t want to

check something that isn't me." The unit commander responded by saying, "Just don't write 'Jedi Knight' or some stupid (expletive) under 'race.' If you don't know your own race, just leave it blank." The enumerator could have easily and tactfully clarified that the MCR form has a space marked "Other" for respondents to fill in the racial or ethnic category with which they self-identify, without offending the unit commanders.

6.4.5 Primary factors affecting the quality and extent of enumerator access to GQ 4

The enumerator had no problems accessing GQ 4 "Base One" and officers were eager to complete (and ensure that their troops completed) the MCR form. There was no possibility for resident non-compliance, and all individuals stationed at the facility on April 1 completed the form. Lieutenant McDaniels, who was stationed at GQ 4 "Base One" at the time of the enumeration, succinctly explained the efficiency and accuracy with which the Census was carried out at this military facility. He noted, "We did it the Army way, get everybody lined up and get through it. You'll probably get a lot more people (who) do it because they're in the Army, because when you're in the Army it's 'hey, you're gonna do this' rather than how it is for the people living at home."

Military life is unique in that troops have a complete lack of autonomy that far exceeds anything experienced by residents at DV-oriented GQ facilities. As Lieutenant White, who was stationed at GQ 4 "Base One" at the time of the enumeration, explained to me, "Prisoners have more rights than we do. We can only get three hours' sleep and MREs (pre-packaged meals ready to eat) in the desert, but you can't do that to prisoners. But I guess the difference is that we signed up for this and a prisoner committed a crime." Troops at GQ 4 "Base One," as is the case at all other military installations, must do as instructed by their commanding officers, including completing the MCR form. It is worth mentioning, however, that military administrative records are inaccessible. These remain with each individual unit commander, and senior officers stationed on GQ 4 "Base One" only maintain a count of the bodies stationed there on a given day. This count is referred to as "boots on ground numbers," and does not contain additional information of interest to the Census Bureau.

6.5 Semi-structured interview results

I conducted three post-enumeration semi-structured interviews with staff members at base one. Using the same methods as with the DV related GQ, five key themes were identified: (1) awareness of the census' importance; (2) respondents' desire for expanded racial and ethnic categories; (3) surprise at the limited number of questions on the ICR/MCR form; (4) "census mystique," a phenomenon in which respondents were unsure of the census' scope, abilities and purpose and (5) concerns regarding over-count at military GQ.

6.5.1 Awareness of the importance of the Census

Staff Sergeant Sanchez, who was stationed at GQ 4 "Base One" at the time of the enumeration, mentioned this in addition to his assertion that every U.S. resident has a duty to complete the Census form. He noted, "Everything on the census is gonna record how many teachers we get, and with the economy the way it is, I mean that's really our only leverage, you know, to kind of take care of our own."

Staff Sergeant Sanchez observed, “For some immigrants, they might be afraid that...the government wants to catch them. If they (the Census Bureau) let you know what it’s for, then they might do it (complete the census form).”

6.5.2 Desire for expanded racial and ethnic categories at military barracks

Lieutenant McDaniels, who was stationed at GQ 4 “Base One” at the time of the enumeration, made a similar point when he critiqued the lack of diversity represented in the term “white.” He described the 2010 MCR form, which he completed, as “very specific about Hispanic, Mexican, Colombian or something like that, and they’re very different in the same way I would be very different from someone who’s Polish or German, but there’s no option for me to mark those things as a white person.” Lieutenant McDaniels’ rather interesting observation about this lack of diversity in the racial and ethnic categories was echoed especially strongly among self-identified Latino interviewees. In an interview with me, Private Rivera, who was stationed at GQ 4 “Base One” at the time of the enumeration, expressed confusion regarding the separation of race and Hispanic origin in questions four and five on the ICR and MCR forms. He noted that these classifications were particularly confusing and troublesome for recent migrants from Central and Latin America, including his wife:

...my wife didn’t understand, because she’s Honduran and that wasn’t on there, so she didn’t know if she was supposed to be Hispanic or Latin American. She put down Latin American, Honduras is near there. She just wanted a little more clarification on that whole Latin American thing, versus Hispanic. I think you should just put “Latino” and not ask for race, though, because that’s it, you know you’re Latino. I don’t think you have any other race.

Staff Sergeant Sanchez, who was stationed at GQ 4 “Base One” at the time of the enumeration, echoed this concern by characterizing the race and hispanicity questions as “such a generalization of groups.” He added that this was complicated for individuals of what he termed “mixed” ancestry and observed that if more categories were added, individuals “might feel more encouraged to fill out the form next time.”

6.5.3 Surprise at the limited number of questions on the Census form at military barracks

Several interviewees expressed surprise at the limited number of questions on the ICR/MCR forms, although all respondents universally expressed the opinion that the form was extremely easy and quick to complete. Captain Poniatowska, who was stationed at GQ 4 “Base One” at the time of the enumeration, was rather disappointed that the ICR/MCR forms contained such a limited number of questions and observed, “It’s much more spartan this year than it’s been in the past and it seems a little less invasive, but not necessarily in a good way.” Three interviewees stationed at GQ 4 “Base One” at the time of the enumeration recommended adding questions on education and income level to the ICR/MCR.

6.5.4 Census mystique and lack of clarity regarding its scope, purpose and abilities at military barracks

Sergeant James, who was stationed at GQ 4 “Base One” at the time of the enumeration, echoed Chloe in expressing a kind of confused surprise that the ICR/MCR forms requested no information about education or income. He observed that he “figured that was normally something that would be collected by the government when you’re looking at statistics.”

6.5.5 Concerns regarding over-count at military group quarters

A recurrent theme expressed by individuals resident at GQ 4 “Base One” at the time of the enumeration concerned a lack of clarity as to whether residents would be double-counted or ignored in their place of origin. This stemmed from the mandatory completion of the MCR form by all residents at the facility on April 1. Given the keen awareness amongst troops of the census’ valuable role in resource allocation, this was a significant source of concern. The underlying sentiment in most of the comments made by officers and troops about the potential for overcount at military GQs concerned what respondents regarded as a high potential for valuable resource diversion from the troops’ usual place of residence, which they self-identify as “home,” to the Midwestern state where they were temporarily stationed when the enumeration took place.

6.6 Recommendations for alternatives to standardized Census Coverage Measurement at military group quarters

My conclusion, overall, is that Census coverage of military GQs is already at its maximum potential due several factors: (1) the impossibility for troops to refuse to complete the MCR form; (2) the military culture of compliance with federal government requirements; and (3) the high degree of organization at military facilities that is quite likely unparalleled at other types of GQs. I strongly recommend that any exercises to assess CCM focus on assessing the incidence of overcount, which would be best and most efficiently accomplished through a matching exercise of duplicated ICR and MCR forms completed by the same individual.

6.6.1 Assessment of coverage error

Considering the 100 percent compliance rate with the census requirements via the completion of MCR forms I observed at GQ 4 “Base One,” there is potential for an overcount among individuals in the military. This is particularly likely for those in the National Guard, who maintain private residences. The best mode for assessing CCM of this population would be the implementation of a matching exercise using both ICR and MCR forms. It would be extremely useful for the Census Bureau to determine how often individuals complete both forms. Doing so will measure the incidence of overcount among officers and troops who completed the ICR form prior to training or deployment or were listed on another family member’s ICR form.

6.6.2 Modifications to measuring Census Coverage Measurement via administrative records and focus groups

Military administrative records are highly unlikely to be obtained by the Census Bureau due to the reasons outlined earlier in this report. The Census Bureau's best chance of obtaining such records in order to conduct a matching exercise that verifies whether the 100 percent rate of MCR form completion also takes place at other military GQ facilities would be through contacting the office of the Judge Advocate General (JAG) responsible for ensuring the facility's legal compliance with confidentiality and administrative records access. This information can be obtained from each military GQ facility from the Office of Public Affairs, the office at every military installation that handles such requests. Focus groups, to be conducted at the military facility, could also be arranged through the Office of Public Affairs. It would be interesting to statistically measure the incidence of double completion of both ICR and MCR forms using the matching exercised proposed above and, if possible, administrative records, and then use focus groups to ascertain troops' and officers' thoughts on this issue.

7 References

- Abraham, Margaret. (2000). *Speaking the Unspeakable: Marital Violence among South Asian Immigrants in the United States*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Adams, Abigail. (1997). "The Military Academy: Metaphors of Family for Pedagogy and Public Life." Pp. 63-78 in Weinstein, Laurie & Christie White, eds. *Wives and Warriors: Women and the Military in the United States and Canada*. New York: Praeger.
- Adler, Patricia. (1993). *Wheeling and Dealing: An Ethnography of an Upper Level Drug Dealing and Smuggling Community*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Armor, David. (1996). *Race and Gender in the U.S. Military*. *Armed Forces and Society* 23: 7-27.
- Augustín, Laura Maria. (2007). *Sex at the Margins: Migration, Labor Migrants and the Rescue Industry*. London: Zed Books.
- Babbie, Earl. (2001). *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Baker, C.K., S.L. Cook, F.H. Norris. (2003). Domestic Violence and Housing Problems: A Contextual Analysis of Women's Help-Seeking, Received Informal Support and Formal System Response. *Violence Against Women* 9(7): 754-783.
- Baldwin, Margaret. (2004). Living in Longing: Prostitution, Trauma Recovery and Public Assistance. Pp. 267-314. In Farley, Melissa, ed. *Prostitution, Trafficking and Traumatic Stress*. New York: Routledge.
- Baldwin, J. Norman & Bruce Rothwell. (1993). Glass Ceilings in the Military. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 13(4): 5-25.
- Becraft, Carolyn. (1992). Women and the Military: Bureaucratic Policies and Politics. In Blacksmith, E.A., ed. *Women in the Military*. New York: The H.W. Wilson Company.
- Bell, Robert M. & Michael Cohen, eds.. (2009). *Panel on Coverage Evaluation and Correlation Bias in the 2010 Census*. Washington, D.C.: National Research Council.
- Ben-Ari, Eyal. (1998). *Mastering Soldiers: Conflict, Emotions and the Enemy in an Israeli Military Unit*. Oxford: Bergahn.
- Benedict, Helen. (2009). *The Lonely Soldier: The Private War of Women Serving in Iraq*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Bernard, H. Russell. (1994). *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, 2nd Edition*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Biank, Tanya. (2007). *Army Wives: The Unwritten Code of Military Marriage*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Blank, Rebecca and Michael Barr, eds.. (2009). *Insufficient Funds: Savings, Assets, Credit and Banking Among Low Income Households*. New York: Russell Sage Foundations.
- Bourgois, Philippe. (2009). *Righteous Dope Fiend*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1995
- Braitstein, Paula, Kathy Li, Mark Tyndall, Patricia Spittal, Michael O'Shaughnessy, Arn Schilder, Caitlin Johnson, Robert Hogg and Martin Schechter. (2003). *Sexual Violence among a Cohort of Injection Drug Users. Social Science & Medicine* 57(3): 561-569.
- Brandwein, Ruth. (1999). Family Violence, Women and Welfare. Pp. 3-16. In Brandwein, R.A., ed. *Battered Women, Children and Welfare Reform: The Ties That Bind*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Brasset, Donna. (1997). Values and the Exercise of Military Power: Military Elites. Pp. 81-90 In Rubinstein, Robert & M. Foster, eds. *The Social Dynamics of Peace and Conflict: Culture in International Security*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing.
- Browne, A. (1998). Responding to the Needs of Low-Income and Homeless Women Who are Survivors of Family Violence. *Journal of the American Women's Association* 53(2): 57-64.
- Browne, A & S.S. Bassuk. (1997). Intimate Violence in the Lives of Homeless and Poor Housed Women: Prevalence and Patterns in an Ethnically Diverse Sample. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 67(2): 261-278.
- Bruno, Martha. (1998). Playing the Cooperation Game: Strategies Around International Aid in Postsocialist Russia. Pp. 170-187 in Sue Bridger, and Francis Pine, eds. *Surviving Postsocialism: Local Strategies and Regional Responses in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. London: Routledge.
- Burawoy, Michael, Alice Burton, Ann Arnett Ferguson and Kathryn J. Fox. (1991). *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn & L. Lewandowski. (1997). Mental and Physical Health Effects of Intimate Partner Violence on Women and Children. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America* 20(2): 353-374.
- Casper, Monica and Lisa Moore. (2009). *Missing Bodies: The Politics of Invisibility*. New York: New York University Press.
- Chang, Iris. (2000). *Disposable Domestic: Immigrant Women Workers in the Global Economy*. London: South End Press.
- Connolly, Deborah. (2000). *Homeless Mothers: Face to Face with Women in Poverty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Counts, Dorothy, Judith Brown & Jacquelyn Campbell, eds.. (1999). *To Have and to Hit: Cultural Perspectives on Wife Beating*. Urbana-Champaign, ILL: University of Illinois Press.
- D'Amico, Francine. (1997). Policing the U.S. Military's Race and Gender Lines. . In *Wives and Warriors: Women and the Military in the United States and Canada*. Laurie Weinstein and Christie White, eds. Pp. 199-234. New York: Praeger.
- Day, Sophie. (2007). *On the Game: Women and Sex Work*. London: Pluto Press.

- Day, Sophie, Akis Papataxiarchis & Michael Stewart, eds.. (1998). *Lilies of the Field: Marginal People Who Live for the Moment*. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.
- de la Puente, Manuel. (1993). Why Are People Missed or Erroneously Included by the Census: A Summary of Findings from Ethnographic Coverage Reports. Report prepared for the Advisory Committee for the Design of the Year 2000 Census, March 5, 1993. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
- DeWalt, Kathleen and Billie DeWalt. (2002). *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Dewey, Susan. (2011, forthcoming). *Neon Wasteland: On Love, Motherhood and Sex Work in a Rust Belt Town*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dewey, Susan. (2008). *Hollow Bodies: Institutional Responses to Sex Trafficking in Armenia, Bosnia and India*. Sterling, VA.: Kumarian Press.
- Dorn, Edwin & Howard Graves. (2000). *American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century: A Report of the CSIS International Security Program*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Edin, Kathryn & Maria Kefalas. (2007). *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood Before Marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edin, Kathryn & Laura Lein. (1997). *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ehrenrich, Barbara and Arlie Russell Hochschild. (2004). *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. London: Owl Books.
- Emerson, Robert, Rachel Fretz and Linda Shaw. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia. (2000). *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enos, Sandra. (2001). *Mothering from the Inside: Parenting in a Women's Prison*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Fals-Stewart, William, James Golden & Julie Schumacher. (2003). "Intimate Partner Violence and Substance Use: A Longitudinal Day-to-Day Examination." *Addictive Behaviors* 28(9): 1555-1574.
- Feinman, Ilene Rose. (2000). *Citizenship Rites: Feminist Soldiers and Feminist Antimilitarists*. New York: New York University Press.
- Fenner, Lorry. (2001). "Moving Targets: Women's Roles in the Military in the Twenty-First Century." Pp. 3-97 in Fenner, Lorry & Marie DeYoung, eds. *Women in Combat: Civic Duty or Military Liability?* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Fetterman, David. (2009). *Ethnography Step-by-Step*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 1998 "Ethnography." In *Handbook of Applied Social Science Research Methods*. Leonard Bickman and Debra Rog, eds. Pp. 473-504. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fischbach, Ruth & Barbara Herbert. (1997). "Domestic Violence and Mental Health: Correlates and Conundrums within and Across Cultures." *Social Science & Medicine* 45(8): 1161-1176.
- Fowler, Dawnovise & Monica Faulkner. (2006). "Substance Abuse Among Female Survivors of Domestic Violence Residing at Shelters." *Alcoholism: Clinical & Experimental Research* 32: 367.
- Frese, Pamela. (2003). "Guardians of the Golden Age: Custodians of the U.S. Military Culture."

- Pp. 45-67 In Frese, Pamela & Margaret Harrell, eds. *Anthropology and the U.S. Military*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fujimura, Clementine. (2003). "Integrating Diversity and Understanding the Other at the U.S. Naval Academy." Pp. 135-146 in Frese, Pamela & Margaret Harrell, eds. *Anthropology and the U.S. Military*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fujimura, Clementine. (1999). "Official and Unofficial Culture: The U.S. Navy." Pp. 55-67 in Naylor, Larry, ed. *Problems and Issues of Diversity in the United States*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gazamararian, Julie, Suzanne Lazorick, Alison Spitz, Terri Ballard, Linda Saltzman & James Marks. (1996). "Prevalence of Violence Against Pregnant Women." *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* 275: 1915-1920.
- Gerson, Kathleen. (2005). *The Time Divide: Work, Family, Gender Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilchrist, Gail, Avril Taylor, David Goldberg, Christina Mackie, Andrea Denovan & Stephen Green. (2001). "Behavioral and Lifestyle Study of Women Using a Drop-In Center for Female Street Sex Workers in Glasgow, Scotland: A 10 Year Comparative Study." *Addiction Research and Theory* 9(1): 43-58.
- Guillemain, Jeanne. (2003). "Medical Risks and the Volunteer Army." Pp. 29-44 in Frese, Pamela & Margaret Harrell, eds. *Anthropology and the United States Military*. New York: Praeger.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. (2004). *The Politics of Disgust: The Public Identity of the Welfare Queen*. New York: New York University Press.
- Harrell, Margaret. (2003). "Gender- and Class-Based Role Expectations for Army Spouses." Pp. 69-94 in Frese, Pamela & Margaret Harrell, eds. *Anthropology and the United States Military*. New York: Praeger.
- 2000 *Invisible Women: Junior Enlisted Army Wives*. Santa Monica, CA.: RAND Corporation.
- Harrison, Deborah & Lucie Laliberte. (1997). "Gender, the Military and Military Family Support." Pp. 35-54 in Weinstein, Laurie & Christie White, eds. *Wives and Warriors: Women and the Military in the United States and Canada*. New York: Praeger.
- Hassler, Robin. (1995). "Domestic Violence and the Politics of Statewide Community." *Women's Health Issues* 5(4): 199-202.
- Hawkins, John Palmer. (2001). *Army of Hope, Army of Alienation: Culture and Contradiction in the American Army Communities of Cold War Germany*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Herman, Judith Lewis. (1992). *Trauma and Recovery*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hoge, C.W., J.L. Auchterlonie & C.S. Milliken. (2006). "Mental Health Problems, Use of Mental Health Services, and Attrition from Military Service After Returning from Deployment to Iraq or Afghanistan." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 295: 1023-1032.
- Hoigard, Cecilie & Liv Finstad. (1992). *Backstreets: Prostitution, Money and Love*. University Park, PA.: Penn State University Press.
- Hollman, Walter 1988 Applying Residence Rules to the Military. *Society* 25(3): 54-55.
- Holloway, Susan, Bruce Fuller, Marylee Rambaud and Costanza Eggers-Pierola. (2001). *Through My Own Eyes: Single Mothers and the Cultures of Poverty*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. (2001). *Domestica: Immigrant Workers, Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ingraham, Larry 1983 *The Boys in the Barracks: Observations on American Military Life*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Iyengar, Radha and Lindsay Sabik. (2009). The Dangerous Shortage of Domestic Violence Services. *Health Affairs* 28: 1052-1065.
- Jasinki, Jana, Jennifer Wesely, James Wright & Elizabeth Mustaine. (2010). *Hard Lives, Mean Streets: Violence in the Lives of Homeless Women*. Chicago: Northeastern University Press.
- Kanuha, Valli. (1996). Domestic Violence, Racism and the Battered Women's Movement in the United States. Pp. 34-52 in Edleson, J & Z. Eisikovits, eds. *Future Interventions with Battered Women and Their Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Katz, P.. (1990). Emotional Metaphors, Socialization and the Roles of Drill Sergeants. *Ethos* 18: 449-478.
- Kendrick, Karen. (1998). Producing the Battered Woman: Shelter Politics and the Power of Feminist Voice. Pp. 151-173 in Naples, Nancy, ed. *Community Activism and Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race, Class and Gender*. London: Routledge.
- Kielty, Sandra. (2008). Non-Resident Motherhood: Managing a Threatened Identity. *Child and Family Social Work* 13(1): 13-40.
- Krane, Julia & Linda Davies. (2002). Sisterhood is Not Enough: The Invisibility of Mothering in Shelter Practice with Battered Women. *Affilia* 17(2): 167-190.
- Kruitschnitt, Candace & Rosemary Gartner. (2005). *Marking Time in the Golden State: Women's Imprisonment in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kushel, Margot, Jennifer Evans, Sharon Perry, Marjorie Robertson & Andrew Ross. (2003). No Door to Lock: Victimization among Homeless and Marginally Housed Persons. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 163(20): 2492-2499.
- Liebow, Elliot. (1995). *Tell Them Who I Am: The Lives of Homeless Women*. New York: Penguin.
- Litzke, Cheryl. (2004). Social Construction of Motherhood and Mothers on Drugs: Implications for Treatment, Policy and Practice. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy* 16(4): 43-59.
- Lutz, Catherine 2002a *Homefront: A Military City and the American Twentieth Century*. Boston: Beacon Publishers.
- 2002b Making War at Home in the United States: Militarization and the Current Crisis. *American Anthropologist* 104(3): 723-735.
- Mann, Ruth. (2002). Emotionality and Social Activism: A Case Study of a Community Development Effort to Establish a Shelter for Women in Ontario. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 31(3): 251-284.
- Markowitz, Lisa and Karen Tice. (2002). Paradoxes of Professionalization: Parallel Dilemmas in Women's Organizations in the Americas. *Gender & Society* 16(6): 941-958.
- Martin, Elizabeth & Manuel de la Puente. (1993). Research on Sources of Undercoverage Within Households. Available online at <http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/sm93-03.pdf>
- McNulty, P.A.. (2000). Comparative Analysis of the Prevalence and Contributing Factors of Eating Disorder Behaviors Among Active Duty Army, Navy and Air Force Service Women in the Health Care Arena, Navy Medical Center. San Diego: U.S. Navy.
- Menard, Anne. (2001). Domestic Violence and Housing: Key Policy and Program Challenges. *Violence Against Women* 7(6): 707-721.

- Meola, Lynn. (1997). Sexual Harassment in the Army. Pp. 145-150 in Weinstein, Laurie & Christie White, eds. *Wives and Warriors: Women and the Military in the United States and Canada*. New York: Praeger.
- Mershon, Sherie & Steven Schlossman. (1998). *Foxholes and Color Lines: Desegregating the U.S. Armed Forces*. Baltimore, MD.: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Muhajarine, Nazeem & Carl D'Arcy. (1999). Physical Abuse During Pregnancy: Prevalence and Risk Factors. *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 160(7): 1007-1011.
- National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) 2009a Domestic Violence Counts 2009: A 24 Hour Census of Domestic Violence Shelters and Services. Washington, D.C.: National Network to End Domestic Violence. Available online at: http://www.nnedv.org/docs/Census/DVCounts2009/DVCounts09_Report_BW.pdf
- National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) 2009b U.S. State and Territorial Coalitions. Washington, D.C.: National Network to End Domestic. Available online at <http://www.nnedv.org/resources/coalitions.html>
- Neubeck, Kenneth & Joel Cazanave. (2001). *Welfare Racism: Playing the Race Card Against America's Poor*. New York: Routledge.
- Ogle, Richard & John Baer. (2003). "Addressing the Service Linkage Problem: Increasing Substance Abuse Treatment Engagement Using Personalized Feedback Interventions in Heavy-Using Female Domestic Violence Shelter Residents." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18(11): 1311-1324.
- O'Sullivan Elizabethann & Abigail Carlton. (2001). "Victim Services, Community Outreach and Contemporary Rape Crisis Centers: A Comparison of Independent and Multiservice Centers." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 16(4): 343-360.
- Ortner, Sherry. (1995). "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37(1): 173-193.
- Owen, Barbara. (1998). *In the Mix: Struggle and Survival in a Women's Prison*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Peach, Lucinda. (1997). "Behind the Front Lines: Feminist Battles Over Women in Combat." Pp. 99-136 in Weinstein, Laurie & Christie White, eds. *Wives and Warriors: Women and the Military in the United States and Canada*. New York: Praeger.
- Pippert, Timothy. (2007). *Road Dogs and Loners: Family Relationships Among Homeless Men*. Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Polakow, Valerie. (1993). *Lives on the Edge: Single Mothers and their Children in the Other America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polusny, Melissa, Christopher Erbes, Paul Arbisi, Paul Thuras, Shannon Kehle, Michael Rath, Cora Courage, Madhavi Reddy & Courtney Duffy. (2009). "Impact of Prior Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom Combat Duty on Mental Health in a Predeployment Cohort of National Guard Soldiers." *Military Medicine* 174(4): 353-357.
- Raphael, Jody. (2004). *Listening to Olivia: Violence, Poverty and Prostitution*. Chicago: Northeastern University Press.
- Rathbone, Christina. (2005). *A World Apart: Women, Prison and Life Behind Bars*. New York: Random House.
- Ratner, P.A.. (1993). "The Incidence of Wife Abuse and Mental Health Status in Abused Wives in Edmonton, Alberta." *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 84: 246-249.
- Richie, Beth. (2000). "A Black Feminist Reflection on the Anti-Violence Movement." *Signs* 25: 1133-1137.

- 1996 *Compelled to Crime: The Gender Entrapment of Battered Black Women*. New York: Routledge.
- Rierdan, Andi. (1997). *The Farm: Life Inside a Women's Prison*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Riger, Stephanie, Larry Bennett, Sharon Mary Wasco, Paul Schewe, Lisa Frohmann, Jennifer Camacho & Rebecca Campbell. (2002). *Evaluating Services for Survivors of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Rivera, Lorna. (2008). *Laboring to Learn: Women's Literacy and Poverty in the Post-Welfare Era*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Rodriguez, Noelle 1988 "Transcending Bureaucracy: Feminist Politics at a Shelter for Battered Women." *Gender & Society* 2(2): 214-227.
- Romero-Daza, Nancy, Margaret Weeks & Merrill Singer. (2003). "Nobody Gives a Damn if I Live or Die": Violence, Drugs and Street Prostitution in Inner City Hartford, Connecticut. *Medical Anthropology* 22(3): 233-259.
- Rothenberg, Bess. (2003). "'We Don't Have Time for Social Change': Cultural Compromise and the Battered Woman Syndrome." *Gender & Society* 17(5): 771-787.
- Rotherman, M.J., K.A. Mahler, C. Koopman & K. Langabeer. (1996). "Sexual Abuse History and Associated Multiple Risk Factors in Adolescent Runaways." *Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 66(3): 390-400.
- Sadler, Georgia. (1997). "Women in Combat: The U.S. Military and the Impact of the Persian Gulf War." Pp. 35-54 in Weinstein, Laurie & Christie White, eds. *Wives and Warriors: Women and the Military in the United States and Canada*. New York: Praeger.
- Schechter, Susan. (1996). "The Battered Women's Movement in the United States: New Directions for Institutional Reform." Pp. 53-66 in Edleson, J & Z Eiskovits, eds. *Future Interventions with Battered Women and Their Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- 1982 *Women and Male Violence: Voices of Mothers in Poverty*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Schmitt, Frederika & Patricia Yancey Martin. (1999). Unobtrusive Mobilization by an Institutionalized Rape Crisis Center: "All We Do Comes from Victims." *Gender & Society* 13(3): 364-384.
- Silva, C., J. McFarlane, K. Soeken, B. Parker & S. Reel. (1997). Symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in Abused Women in a Primary Care Setting. *Journal of Women's Health* 6: 543-552.
- Simons, Anna. (1999). War: Back to the Future. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28: 73-108.
- Simons, Anna. (1997). *The Company They Keep: Life Inside the U.S. Army Special Forces*. New York: Free Press.
- Simons, Ronald & Les Whitbeck. (1991). Sexual Abuse as a Precursor to Prostitution and Victimization among Adolescent and Adult Homeless Women. *Journal of Family Issues* 12 (3): 361-379.
- Smith, Daniel. (2008). *A Culture of Corruption: Everyday Deception and Popular Discontent in Nigeria*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Spradley, James. (1999). *You Owe Yourself a Drink: An Ethnography of Urban Nomads*. Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press.
- Stiehm, Judith. (1996). *It's Our Military, Too!: Women and the U.S. Military*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Susser, Ida 1982 *Norman Street: Poverty and Politics in an Urban Neighborhood*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, J.. (1993). *Doing Critical Ethnography: Qualitative Research Methods*, Vol. 26. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tierney, Kathleen 1982 *The Battered Women's Movement and the Creation of the Wife Beating Problem*. *Social Problems* 29: 207-220.
- Urla, Jacqueline. (1993). *Cultural Politics in an Age of Statistics: Numbers, Nations, and the Making of a Basque Identity*. *American Ethnologist* 20(4): 818-843.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2009).. (2010). *Census Group Quarters Definitions and Code List*. Signed Internal Memorandum, U.S. Census Bureau, September 17, 2009.
- Venkatesh, Sudhir. (2006). *Off the Books: The Underground Economy of the Urban Poor*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Waterston, Alisse. (1999). *Love, Sorrow and Rage: Destitute Women in a Manhattan Residence*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wedel, Janine. (1998). *Collision or Collusion? The Strange Case of Western Aid to Eastern Europe, 1990-1997*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- West, Carolyn. (2002). *Battered, Black, and Blue: An Overview of Violence in the Lives of Black Women*. *Women and Therapy* 25(3/4): 5-27.
- Wies, Jennifer. (2006). *The Changing Relationship of Women Helping Women: Patterns and Trends in Domestic Violence Advocacy*. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Kentucky.
- Willis, Paul 1981 *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wingwood, Gina, Ralph DiClemente & Anita Raj. (2000). *Adverse Consequences of Intimate Partner Abuse Among Women in Non-Urban Domestic Violence Shelters*. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 19(4): 270-275.
- Wolcott, Harry. (2008). *Ethnography: A Way of Seeing*. London: AltaMira.
- Zaharlick, A. (1992). *Ethnography and Anthropology and its Value for Education*. *Theory into Practice* 31(2): 116-125.
- Zelizer, Viviana. (1997). *The Social Meaning of Money: Pin Money, Paychecks, Poor Relief and Other Currencies*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Ziegler, Sara & Gregory Gunderson. (2005). *Moving Beyond G.I. Jane: Women and the U.S. Military*. Lanham, MD.: University Press of America.

8 Appendix A: Quick Reference Guide to the Use of Pseudonyms

Following standard ethnographic practice, I have employed pseudonyms to protect the identities of the individuals discussed and have altered the names of organizations that could be easily identified by virtue of their geographic location.

Allison: A staff member at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter.”

Angela: The Census point of contact at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter.” Angela works as an advocate at the shelter, a job that includes direct daily contact with residents and their children.

Annie: A staff member at (and former resident of) GQ 1 “New Directions” who coordinates volunteer activities and oversees the distribution of donated clothing and toys.

Cherisse: Resident of GQ 1 “New Directions.”

Cheyenne: A staff member and advocate at GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter,” whose main responsibilities include case management of residents.

Ella: An occasional resident of “Sharon’s Place,” a homeless shelter located in the same Midwestern town.

GQ 1 “New Directions”: A longer-term residential facility in a large Midwestern town for women and their children who have experienced domestic violence.

GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter”: A Midwestern residential facility that houses women and their children fleeing violence at home.

GQ 3 “Safe Harbor”: A longer-term residential facility, located in a major Midwestern city, for women and their children who have experienced domestic violence.

GQ 4 “Base One”: A Midwestern military barracks housing troops for pre-deployment training.

Jessie: A resident of GQ 2 “Emergency Shelter.”

Jolene: A resident of GQ 1 “New Directions.”

Juanita: The director of GQ 3 “Safe Harbor.”

La Tanya: A staff member and advocate at GQ 1 “New Directions,” whose main work responsibilities included case management of residents.

Lieutenant White: The point of contact for all Census-related communications at GQ 4 “Base One.”

Loretta: A resident of the homeless shelter “Sharon’s Place.”

Patty: Census worker and supervisor to both of the enumerators I observed.

Sarah: A staff member and advocate at GQ 1 “New Directions.”

“Sharon’s Place”: A homeless shelter located in the same large Midwestern town as GQ 1 “New Directions.”

Tyler: The site manager and Census point of contact at GQ 1 “New Directions.”

9 Appendix B: Post-Enumeration Semi-Structured Interview Questions for GQ Staff

Questions were grouped by four thematic areas, underlined below.

Respondent's Previous Experiences with the Census Bureau

1. Please tell me about your experiences with the Census Bureau prior to the 2010 enumeration.
2. What have been your most significant impressions in dealing with the Census Bureau in the past?

Respondent's Perceptions of the 2010 Census Form

3. Is the Census form easy or difficult to fill out?
4. Was there anything missing from the form that you think should have been included?

Respondent's Impressions of the 2010 Enumeration Process

5. How did residents here talk about the census and decide whether or not to fill it out the forms? Who did ask if they had questions?
6. What sorts of discussions did people here have about the census after the enumerator left and the forms were (or were not) completed?
7. Please describe how the enumerators' interactions with staff and residents while at the facility.

Respondent's Understanding of the Mode of Information Collection

8. How were residents informed about the census and did they accept the census instructions?
9. Do you have any recommendations about how the Census could be more effectively carried out at your facility in the future?