

STUDY SERIES
(*Survey Methodology #2013-13*)

**Ethnographic Study of the Group Quarters Population
in the 2010 Census: Jails and Prisons**

Barbara Owen¹
Anna Chan

¹California State University, Fresno

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

Report Issued: April 25, 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

In examining the factors that shape the ability of the U.S. Census Bureau to accurately count those confined to correctional facilities, a qualitative case study was conducted to assess the 2010 enumeration in these Group Quarters. These data are also the basis for recommendations about future Census Coverage Measurement to both assess census coverage accuracy and improve census processes in correctional group quarters. The study also identifies social, cultural, operational and other dynamic factors that affect census coverage and may produce coverage errors. The 2010 Census is described through qualitative observations and unstructured interviews in three primary study sites and three secondary sites. The primary sites include two women's state prisons and one county jail, conducted between March and May 2010. Secondary sites were a large male prison visited during the observation of the American Community Survey (ACS), the state correctional agency main office and a small women's prison in another state. Problems and successes specifically related to coverage accuracy are also described. Several research questions directed this qualitative investigation:

1. How was the 2010 Census conducted in two women's prisons and one jail?
2. What factors affect the quality of data collected in these correctional Group Quarters?
3. What types of coverage and enumeration problems exist in prisons and jails?
4. How can a Census Coverage Measurement (CCM) follow-up study be conducted in prisons and jails?
5. What is the best approach to ensuring an accurate and complete enumeration in correctional Group Quarters for the 2020 Census?

1.1 Results

Administrative records, defined as those used to administer government programs, were used in all of the facilities observed in this study. Hard copies of these records ("rosters" in correctional parlance) were provided by individual facilities to Census Bureau enumerators who then entered the data on the ICRs. Due to the custodial nature of prisons and jails, these rosters were judged to be of high quality in terms of accurate and complete listings of all present when a comprehensive listing was printed. The Census Bureau can have a high level of confidence in the use of administrative records when a complete and comprehensive roster is obtained.

The use of administrative rosters, in theory, did not introduce any obvious errors into the enumeration process. In practice, however, incomplete rosters that do not list the entire population create the potential for undercounting. Misalignment between official census categories of race and ethnicity and the administrative rosters resulted in subjective, and often arbitrary, ICR completions. Truncated names in delimited roster fields may also contribute to inadequate enumeration. Coding errors can be introduced in transferring data printed from electronic databases by hand into the machine-readable ICR forms.

Several contextual factors must also be considered in planning and assessing census coverage measurement: population dynamics created by releases, transfers and other forms of population movement; operational issues such as security and day-to-day demands of institutional life; and inmate and staff culture. This study found that perspectives on task completion and authority structures affected the interaction between institutional staff and the census enumerators and should be considered in future census activities. Any second enumeration must consider the extreme fluidity of correctional populations over a short time.

While the Census Bureau can have confidence in the completeness of the administrative data, several aspects of the decennial census planning and execution process were less successful and may affect coverage. Census workers and correctional staff at each site negotiated a unique, non-standardized and independent method of producing these rosters. Different rosters were used in each of two main prison sites. There was no evidence of a consistent protocol or common methodology at any of the observed study sites or in the state correctional agency's main office. This lack of coordination, particularly failing to provide adequate information to the individual facilities about specific census requirements, using different types of rosters and staying out of contact with the facilities leading up to the facilities, introduced potential coverage errors. "Correctional courtesies" (a type of professional behavior specific to jails and prisons) were also missing in interactions between facility and Census Bureau staff, contributing to frustrations and census fatigue at these sites.

It is also important to note that differences among correctional group quarters affect census process improvement. Jails (made up of both short-term pre-trial detention inmates and those sentenced to less than a year) and prisons (composed of sentenced inmates, typically serving over one year) require different approaches in census improvement and assessing census coverage errors. Jails, with a high level of population turnover, may present a challenge as their inmates may be counted in both housing unit and GQ enumerations. The decentralized and local nature of jail administration requires a local, facility-level data collection approach. Prisons, with a somewhat less fluid population, and more centralized administration (state and federal, for the most part) present an opportunity to test a data collection approach at an agency, rather than facility, level.

1.2 Recommendations

Census Coverage Measurement (CCM):

A second enumeration of the correctional populations enumerated during the decennial census is possible and could, most optimally, be conducted by using specifically programmed agency-wide automated data for both the initial census and the CCM study for prison GQs. Agency-level data have the capacity to be programmed both in real time (covering the census period) and retrospectively (listing the population a second time for the original period covered by the census enumeration) to compare data collected during the decennial enumeration and at any time in the future. This data could be programmed to produce output organized by institution and aligned with census blocks. Agency-level data would be available for all state and federal prisons systems and may also be found in jails with sophisticated data management capabilities. This would require long-term planning and development with the data managers or researchers at the headquarters or central offices of each state and federal prison system, but would improve data quality, the possibility of a CCM study and reduce costs by coordinating and collecting data

at a centralized level. Jails would need a different approach which must be carefully considered due to their decentralized administrative structure, rapid turnover and varied data management capabilities.

Another area relating to coverage measurement concerns the types of data contained within each administrative data set. While names, birthdays and gender are highly reliable in correctional administrative records, the mismatch between federal labels for race and ethnicity and widely variant labels used in these correctional systems illustrate the need to examine these important categories to improve census coverage.

Census Process Improvement:

State and Federal prisons data are best approached from an agency, rather than individual, perspective. The 2010 Census was based on a facility/census block orientation. This resulted in an individual and negotiated enumeration process at the three facilities observed here and, presumably, all of the 1,185 state and Federal correctional facilities in the U.S. If administrative data is to be used in correctional GQs for the 2010 Census, examining the use of agency-wide data in these 51 systems should be considered. In addition to reducing the burden on the individual facilities, an agency-wide approach would produce consistent reports across these state and Federal correctional GQs. An agency approach would also reduce inefficiencies for census field staff. Working at an agency level to customize these administrative reports would provide the population lists for large numbers of individuals in a relatively short time.

Investing time in an agency approach presents additional benefits for accuracy and cost-savings. Working closely with agency programmers, preparation for the 2020 Census could result in more consistent definitions of the race and ethnic categories both across the system and with the established census categories. Gaining knowledge of the structure and content of these databases could also result in the development of “census subroutines” in electronic form, eliminating the need to code data from hard copies into census machine-readable forms. Such an approach would not be appropriate for the over 3,000 county jails, with one exception. The large, urban jails are likely to maintain databases similar to these prisons and could be included in a modified agency approach.

Dedicated protocols and correctional specialists:

Related to this agency approach is the development of a correctional protocol for these GQs. These protocols would structure enumerations at jails and prisons in a common and consistent way. Should the individual facility approach be retained, a protocol that names the optimal type of population report, a lexicon that translates racial and ethnic categories and other negotiated and subjective decisions that introduce coverage errors might reduce such errors.

Prior to the 2020 Census, a written protocol should be developed with specific information pertinent to correctional settings. A review of the protocols used in the Correctional ACS may be instructive. While each state prison system and the Federal Bureau of Prisons would need a customized section (whether an agency approach is adopted or the individual facility approach is retained), the time invested in an agency-wide approach would produce benefits, such as reducing regional office time and providing consistent records within each system. Investing time at determining the best type of data for the upcoming censuses and developing a system-wide protocol will avoid the duplication of effort and the potential for

subjective results present in the observed approach which relied on negotiations and enumerations at these sites.

The Census Bureau should also consider developing correctional specialists who have a solid grasp of census issues in correctional facilities. Deploying these specialists throughout a given system, despite crossing Census Bureau regional office boundaries, may also introduce efficiencies. Whether the Census Bureau adopts an agency approach for prisons or continues to use the individual facility approach, collaborating with agency population data managers to determine the best approach will introduce efficiencies and standardize the process throughout the system. At minimum, system-wide contact information or a dedicated “hotline” for further information should be developed.

Research:

A survey of correctional approaches of all state and Federal prisons and a stratified random sample of U.S. jails should be conducted to determine the range of enumeration approaches used by correctional facilities for Census 2010. This survey can serve double duty in exploring the utility of automated enumerations using these system-wide databases in future enumerations.

To test the potential for inmate self-enumeration in correctional facilities, a self-enumeration pilot project mirroring the community (free world housing unit) approach should be developed. Process and outcome evaluation methodologies should be employed through a multi-level collaboration.

2 Background

2.1 Introduction and Goals

In examining the factors that shape the ability of the Census Bureau to accurately count those confined to correctional facilities, a qualitative case study was conducted to assess the 2010 enumeration in these Group Quarters. This data was also collected in order to make recommendations about future Census Coverage Measurement (CCM) to both assess census coverage accuracy and improve census processes in correctional group quarters. The study also identifies social, cultural, operational and other dynamic factors that affect census coverage and may produce coverage errors.

This report is one of six that outline ethnographic research on group quarters populations. The research and writing of the report were carried out by the first author (Owen), and the description of the methods and findings are written from her sole perspective. The study design was conceived by the second author (Chan) who also guided the writing of the report.

Using ethnographic and other qualitative methods, this report provides: 1) a description and analysis of the social context that shaped the Census 2010 enumeration process; and 2) recommendations for improving the census enumeration process in correctional facilities in the future and 3) possible options for implementing CCM studies in correctional facilities.

The census process is described through qualitative observations and unstructured interviews in two women's state prisons and one county jail (Group Quarter Types 103 and 104) conducted between March and May 2010. Additional interviews were conducted at three secondary sites visited in the course of the field work: a large male prison visited during the observation of the American Community Survey (ACS), the correctional agency main office of the prison sites and a small women's prison in another state.

Several research questions directed this qualitative investigation:

1. How was the 2010 Census conducted in two women's prisons and one jail?
2. What factors affect the quality of data collected in these correctional Group Quarters?
3. What types of coverage and enumeration problems exist in prisons and jails?
4. How can a Census Coverage Measurement (CCM) follow-up study be conducted in prisons and jails?
5. What is the best approach to ensuring an accurate and complete enumeration in correctional Group Quarters for the 2020 Census?

In examining the existing enumeration procedures, this Final Report traces the process leading up to Census Day 2010, reports on the activities of the facility staff and the census enumerators during enumeration processes, and makes recommendations as to how to improve the quality, efficiency and accuracy of the enumeration in future censuses. This project investigated the successes, challenges and problems experienced by facility and census staff within the myriad cultural, social, practical and operational factors that provide a context for the census enumeration. This ethnography discusses the ways the facilities learned about, prepared for, experienced and reflected on the overall census process. The alternative enumeration aspect of the project addresses problems of coverage at two of the primary sites. The 2000 GQ Enumeration report (Jonas, 2003, p. 46) anticipated the use of administrative records ("rosters" in correctional terminology) in large correctional facilities and the need to coordinate with

correctional agencies in developing such processes. This project examines the use of these records and coordination efforts.

2.2 Census Coverage Measurement

This report draws on the definition of Census Coverage Measurement (CCM) as suggested by the National Research Council (2007, p. 2-11): CCM involves assessing the quality of the census data and improving the census process for subsequent decennial enumerations. One measure of census data quality can be thought of as understanding coverage errors, such as under and over counts, duplications or omissions, residence, missing data and enumerator errors.

This report suggests Census Coverage Measurement (CCM) methods to address the specific dynamics and context of this setting in order to both assess the quality and coverage of the data obtained in these sites and to contribute to census process improvement in the future. The recommendations provided in this report include options for measuring components of coverage error by pursuing automated and retrospective data options in jails and prisons. This ethnography study does not address any issue relating to census count adjustments.

2.3 Prisons and Jails in the United States

2.3.1 Population and Facility Data

Prisons and jails represent several types of Group Quarters, including state and federal prisons, jails and other forms of detention centers ¹, and comprise about 25 percent of all people living in Group Quarters, as defined by the Census Bureau. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) collects population data on those living in US prisons and jails and reports on the number of correctional facilities in operation. The latest BJS Census of Correctional Facilities found 1,821 state and Federal prisons operating in 2005 (Stephan, 2008). Of the state and Federal prisons, more than half of the nation's correctional facilities were rated as minimum (low) security, more than a quarter as medium security, and more than a fifth were rated as maximum (high) security. An additional 221 facilities are community-based facilities. Security levels have some implication for interactive enumeration activities: security (facility) and custody (individual) levels determine how much unescorted movement is possible within a given institution and by a given individual.

Although not included in this study, juvenile and immigration facilities, as well as tribal and private correctional systems are included in correctional group quarters. In developing a sampling frame for a national study unrelated to census questions, BJS has suggested that almost 8000 facilities can be considered correctional institutions.

BJS provides more current prison population data: At the end of 2008, the total incarcerated population in the United States and territories was 2,424,279 (Sabol, West & Cooper, 2009, Table 9). At the state and Federal levels, there were over 1.6 million inmates. In the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) alone, over 200,000 women and men were imprisoned mid-year 2008, making BOP the largest of all prison systems in the US. State prisons holding large numbers of inmates include California, Texas, Florida, Illinois and New York.

¹ This includes Federal Detention Centers (101), Federal and State Prisons (102 & 103), and Local Jails and Other Municipal Confinement Facilities (104).

There are other forms of Federal incarceration outside the Bureau of Prisons. Individuals confined in Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) facilities numbered 9,957 (Sabol et al 2009: Table 11) with another 1,651 incarcerated in military-based facilities. Separate correctional facilities are also found in Indian country; 2,135 people were held in their jails in 2008. Over 13,000 inmates lived in territorial prisons.

It is instructive to note the difference between jurisdictional counts (having jurisdiction over inmates during their sentence) and custodial counts (having physical custody at a given location). For example, the State of Hawaii has legal authority over all women sentenced by their state courts, and therefore includes them in jurisdictional counts. The majority of their female prison population, however, is confined to private (contract) facilities in other states, primarily Oklahoma. These inmates would then appear in the custodial count and, ideally, the census listing of the Oklahoma facility. These differences would be identified in automated data. BJS data show that, nation-wide, 3,365 jails were operational in 2005 (Stephan, 2008) with an overall population of 785,556 in local jails on June 30, 2008 (Sabol et al, 2009: Table 8). These facilities are more likely to have facility-specific databases and be locally (e.g. territory or city/county) administered. In a large jail system, like Los Angeles County (CA) with 21,000 inmates, a single data system would contain information on all those inmates confined within their system, regardless of their physical location in multiple jail and detention facilities throughout the county. Over one-third of all inmates held in custody at midyear 2008 were in local jails (Sabol, et al, 2009). More than half (52 percent) were housed in the 180 largest jail facilities, with average daily populations of 1,000 inmates or more.

Jails present specific challenges to census enumeration. The dynamics of jail intake and releases, as well as length of stay, contribute to a highly fluid population. Although an estimated 13.6 million inmates were admitted to local jails during the 12-month period ending June 30, 2008, 785,556 (Sabol et al 2009: Table 8) appeared on the rosters on the June 30 BJS count. This churning (in and out over relatively short periods) is also bounded by jail status: Almost two-thirds (63 percent) of all jail inmates counted at that point were awaiting court action or had not been convicted of their current charge, and can be thought of as pre-sentence or pretrial inmates. Many of these pretrial inmates may only be detained in jail for a few hours while being processed. For example, a person arrested at 11:00 p.m. on March 31 may appear on the roster on April 1 but released back into the community later in the day on April 1 and thus not meet any census definition of residence in the jail.

Most jails have two distinct functions: a short-term lockup where just-arrested and other pretrial and unsentenced inmates are held for a short time and a longer-term detention and corrections facility where sentenced inmates are held. A good guess is that most jails release the majority of their pretrial inmates within 72 hours. These pre-arraignment detainees make up the majority of inmates who are booked into jail, but may account for a very small proportion of jail beds on any given day. This number depends on release, citation and bail policies of the jurisdiction. It is difficult to estimate how many of these “non-residential” individuals per census definitions occupy beds on any cross-sectional count via administrative rosters (like that collected on April 1). This dynamic—lots of short-term detainees (measured in hours) dominating the admissions but occupying very few beds—could affect valid enumerations and contribute to duplicate coverage errors. In short, jail populations present a specific possibility of duplicate enumerations and complexities in defining residence.

2.3.2 Privatization

Privatization of correctional facilities is another trend to be considered in examining census coverage. Sabol, et al (2009) found that 126,249 state and Federal prisoners were housed in private facilities at the end of 2008. While many of these private facilities are located in the same state contracting for the services, some systems often contract with private correctional agencies outside their home state (as in the above case of Hawaii). As of 2005, 451 private facilities were open. Fully one-third of these facilities were under contract with the BOP. Stephan (2005) found that the number of private facilities increased by 57 percent between 2000 and 2005. It is difficult to anticipate the type of data systems available in these private facilities. However, most large correctional contractors operate facilities in several states and may possess sophisticated data systems to track inmates.

2.3.3 Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Imprisonment Rates

Data collected by BJS also demonstrates imprisonment rates vary across racial, ethnic and gender groups (Sabol, et al, 2009). These differences may have implications for census enumeration and census coverage. About 37 percent of all male inmates at midyear 2008 were black, resulting in an incarceration rate 6.6 times the rate of white males. At midyear 2008, black males (846,000) outnumbered white males (712,500) and Hispanic males (427,000) among inmates in prisons and jails (Sabol, et al, 2009). BJS data also show that female incarceration rates were substantially lower than male incarceration rates at every age. Black females were more than twice as likely as Hispanic females and over 3.5 times more likely than white females to have been in prison or jail on June 30, 2008 (Sabol, et al, 2009). An estimated 207,700 women were held in prisons or jails at midyear 2008. These race/ethnicity and gender differences in prison and jail populations relate to accuracy of enumeration and racial/ethnic categorization within administrative records. Such records, as discussed below, may inaccurately categorize these demographic variables.

2.3.4 Operational Issues Related to Group Assembly among Inmates

When considering any type of group assembly related to inmate self-enumeration, several operational factors come into play. Inmate ability to move within a given facility differs widely. As security levels increase, inmate ability to move and assemble correspondingly decreases. In minimum security facilities, inmates may be allowed to move and assemble freely in groups. Maximum security inmates rarely leave their cells. Some facilities have “open” movement and others have escorted movement. In closed movement facilities, inmates must have individual “call-outs” or “ducats.” Some inmates are confined to “segregation,” “high security,” or mental health units and cannot move to common areas. These inmates must be either seen in their housing units (or cell) or transported by correctional officer escorts. At the extreme end, as many as five correctional officers are used to move inmates from one part of the facility to another.

These inmate call-outs are extremely staff intensive. A recent non-census study conducted by the research team in the facilities studied here involved several days of inmate call-outs. We estimate that it took three full days of research staff time and several hours of prison staff time to arrange for these group surveys. Assembling inmates in groups to fill out the ICR forms would be extremely demanding on staff time and be quite difficult to arrange.

2.3.5 Correctional Population Dynamics

All correctional populations are dynamic over time. Between 2000 and 2008, rates of admissions and release have been somewhat even (Sabol, et al, 2009). In 2008, state and Federal prisons reported 739,132 admissions and 735,454 releases (Sabol, et al, 2009, p.3). These figures represent discrete admissions and releases and should not be interpreted as a complete refresh of the population. A significant core of inmates lives in the same prison (or prison system) for consecutive years. This proportion of “long-termers” varies greatly. Others, typically parole violators or other “short-termers” and “churners,” may be admitted and released multiple times in a one-year period. These two types of release and readmissions stagger the prison population in any given time period. To illustrate these dynamics in the study sites, a brief discussion of population movements in the Jail and WP 1 sites can be found in Appendix 1.

2.4 The Correctional Context and the Census Process

Like other Group Quarters (GQ), prison and jail populations live in total institutions, with all facets of living occurring in a specific setting. Unlike other GQ settings, prison and jail populations are unique in that their residence is coerced and thus non-voluntary. Multiple population and facility characteristics may affect the census enumeration. Some inmates have specific characteristics (including illiteracy, disruptive behavior or mental health conditions) that may affect self-enumeration or interview by an enumerator. Prisons, and to a lesser extent, jails, have a specific inmate culture that is bound by specific values and norms. Staff, too, work in an environment shaped by their own correctional values and perspectives. For purposes of improving census processes, knowledge of the correctional environment and observing “correctional courtesies” are essential to any successful project conducted by outsiders. In addition to these behavioral, cognitive and cultural issues, operational factors, such as segregated housing units or security constraints, may further interfere with accurate counts.

2.4.1 Inmate Culture

Inmate culture, although typically stable over time within a specific type of facility, varies widely across female and male prisons, security levels and traditions internal to given facilities. Specific components of this culture may influence a successful direct enumeration. “Respect” is one value shared by inmates and correctional staff alike. While difficult to define in the lay context, respect concerns behaviors, attitudes, actions and language that affirm and acknowledge an individual’s self-worth and avoid any challenge, however slight, to identity, autonomy, equality and sense of self. Information is another valued commodity in correctional settings. Providing inmates with information about the census, particularly how and when the information would be collected and, equally important, how the information is to be used, would contribute to higher response rates.

In some prisons and jails, a peer culture could influence inmate participation in any census activities. Sometimes referred to as “shot-callers,” these informal leaders have some sway over inmate behavior in both positive and negative ways. Many prisons and jails also have formal inmate organizations that elect inmate leaders. Both informal and formal leaders may set

the tone for participation in any activity and should be considered when developing any self-enumeration plans.

Most inmates welcome opportunities to participate in activities unrelated to the boredom and routine of prison life. Contact with the “free world” is also highly valued. Opportunities to provide input in any process are rare in the prison world: census participation and contributing their “voice” to an activity expected of other citizens would be welcomed by the majority of inmates. Like other individuals who have literacy or comprehension problems, inmates would be hesitant to reveal any problems in reading and comprehending written or spoken instructions. Second language issues, just as in the free world, would also be of concern in correctional populations. Inmates, like all human beings, appreciate being asked politely to participate in activities and respond to requests that assume they have the right to consent or refuse. Although most inmates have little choice in their daily routine, they typically resent being “told what to do.” Offering a choice to inmates would be a highly productive strategy for securing cooperation. Inmate populations are highly heterogeneous. While inmate response to written forms varies widely due to literacy, cooperativeness, compliance with official requests and other behavioral issues, it is very possible that the majority of inmates would respond to individually distributed ICR forms. However, it would be very difficult to list those inmates who would complete ICRs in good faith and those who would be noncompliant or incapable of accurately completing the forms.

2.4.2 Correctional Staff Culture

Staff working in correctional facilities also have a specific occupational culture, with some values shared with the inmate world. Respect is chief among those cultural values shared by inmates and correctional staff. While the quasi-military structure of most facilities creates a formal respect for position, staff culture also contributes to judgments about the worthiness of self and others. Correctional staff also respect authority, a sense of having power (sometimes known as “juice” in inmate and staff worlds), and the skills and knowledge to accomplish a given task. These facilities are also very fast-paced, with a premium placed on staff time, particularly when asked to do a task outside the normal routine. Correctional staff are typically outcome-oriented and rely on standardized procedures to reach a given goal. Developing a written plan, following procedures to execute the plan and marking it “complete” so they can move on to the next assignment are values that characterize these activities. Duplication of effort is particularly resented.

There is also an expectation that outsiders interacting with the prison or jail have some substantive knowledge of the facility and display respect for this world. Understanding how the facility “works” means aligning one’s language and actions with knowledge of correctional populations, their organizational structure, operational procedures and security concerns. Having to “school” outsiders (particularly those asking the facility to perform any task or provide any service or information on any of these facts of institutional operation) is likely to undermine cooperation. No matter how knowledgeable and experienced, even seasoned outsiders are expected to act like guests in this closed world. In prisons and jails, “correctional courtesies” are essential to any successful project conducted by outsiders. Recognizing the reality of prison or jail life, learning established procedures, addressing staff by rank, acknowledging the scope of their authority, being knowledgeable about the prison or jail, presenting one’s request in a brief

but comprehensive form, and expressing gratitude for the assistance are customs essential to any successful interaction in the correctional world.

2.5 Organizational Features of Correctional Facilities

2.5.1 Authority Structures

Jails and prisons are hierarchical institutions. Budgeting and decision-making authority is held by managers and executives at the top, with a quasi-military structure distributing authority down through the system. All state and Federal prisons operate within a centralized and bureaucratic administrative structure. Policy and procedures are developed by staff located in a central or main office, with little contact with the day-to-day field operations. Requests from an outside agency or individuals seeking to conduct research or collect information must be approved via a “top down” organizational structure. While each prison has a warden or superintendent responsible for supervising day to day facility operations, the central authority determines agency-wide policies and procedures. Jails operate with the hierarchical structure although at a local level. Typically, a county executive, such as a sheriff, has overall administrative authority in the jail and other county-wide law enforcement responsibilities. A captain or other high-level manager typically has the responsibility for all jail operations. From a national perspective, jails have a decentralized structure, although their internal structure is also top-down and quasi-military in nature.

2.5.2 Task Orientation

Jails and prisons are intensely active institutions. Ensuring that inmates and staff are safe, monitoring movements in, out and within the facility, providing, food, services and programs for hundreds or thousands of individual prisoners is a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week task. These operational processes are highly routinized and are shaped by written and standardized procedures and post orders. Complicating these demands is overcrowding. Contemporary correctional facilities operate well over capacity and, in these days of reduced budgets, are often asked to “do more with less.”

2.5.3 Automated Data Systems

Modern correctional facilities operate through various forms of automated data and corresponding systems. Producing printed reports related to “counts” and to multiple operational procedures is routine, although few staff at the facility level program the data. Instead, routine reports are produced by correctional staff who “run a report” that has been structured by others and have little knowledge of the structure, content and flexibility of their data systems. While jails more typically have data management staff at the facility level, most state-level correctional facilities rely on agency main office staff for this service. The trend toward more sophisticated and complex databases holds some promise for the use of these automated administrative data in future census enumerations.

2.6 The Study Sites

This project describes the enumeration of male and female inmates and detainees in both prison and jail facilities. These facilities include Women's Prison 1 (WP 1), Women's Prison 2 (WP 2), and the County Jail. No inmates were observed or interviewed at any of the study sites.

Study site 1: Women's Prison 1 – Women's Prison 1 (WP 1) is staffed by 631 custody staff members and assisted by 577 support staff. This facility was designed for a capacity of 2,004 inmates and housed 3,740 on April 1, 2010. Women's Prison 1 houses female state prison inmates of all custody levels (minimum to maximum) including administrative segregation, reception center inmates, and all condemned female inmates in the state. This site was included in the original research proposal.

There were two primary respondents at WP 1. One WP 1 staff member, Lt. First, was the primary contact with both the Census Bureau and research team; he provided administrative rosters to the Census Bureau and the research team and arranged the actual enumeration from these administrative records on site. Another WP 1 (LC 1) staff was the backup contact and coordinated the American Community Survey data collection. One observation of the prison staff was made during the day when a planned Title 13 training event did not occur. This facility planned to enumerate the population with staff resources from administrative records. Once the census crew leader failed to follow through on the training, the offer to supply facility staff was withdrawn and the enumeration was done by census enumerators. No Census Bureau staff were observed or interviewed at this site.

Study site 2: Women's Prison 2 – Women's Prison 2 (WP 2) is staffed by 534 custody staff members and 524 support staff. This facility was designed with a capacity of 1,536 inmates and housed 3,549 on April 1, 2010. Much like WP 1, this facility houses female offenders of all custody levels (minimum to maximum), reception center inmates, those in administrative segregation, and has the only security housing unit for female offenders in the state. Two WP 2 staff members served as local facility liaisons designated to work with the Census Bureau. Lt. Second was the primary contact here. The Warden of WP 2 was also briefly interviewed. This site was added to the study in course of the field work because of an initial plan to have the inmates self-enumerate. In this attempt, WP 2 staff considered using an inmate group to distribute the ICRs to the inmate population, but this approach was abandoned on April 1. One brief observation of a team of Census Bureau enumerators was conducted well after April 1 when the census enumerators worked at WP 2 to record census data from the printed administrative rosters.

Study site 3: The County Jail – The County Jail is located in the downtown area of a medium-sized city in the same state. This jail holds pretrial (unsentenced) and sentenced inmates and boarders from state and federal agencies. As of April 1, 2010, the total activated bed capacity of all three County Jail facilities was 2,508. The Main Jail and North Annex Jail facilities are newer, direct supervision facilities and, currently, have an activated bed capacity of 1,064 and 864 beds respectively. At the time of Census 2010, the Jail held over 2,300 inmates. One jail staff member, the Sergeant, participated in the interviews for this study and was the only contact with both the Census Bureau and the research team; he provided the administrative rosters to the Census Bureau and to the research team. The Census Bureau Crew Leader, who worked with the Jail, was interviewed at the Census Bureau office. She was joined by her supervisor.

3 Methods

Three overlapping qualitative data collection methods were employed to develop this study of correctional facility Group Quarters: brief ethnographic observations, face-to-face interviews, and document review. All observations and interviews were transcribed and then coded. Analyses were based on inductive methods. These data were collected and analyzed to describe the process of conducting census work in these correctional facility group quarters.

3.1 Ethnography

Ethnographic research is a form of qualitative research that seeks to discover the social and cultural context of any given setting (Agar, 1996; Denizen & Lincoln, 1994; Fetterman, 1998). Berg (2008) has defined ethnography as the science of cultural description. Ethnographic analysis is usually inductive (Charmaz, 2006), with theories or explanation derived from what Gertz (1983) calls “thick description,” those drawn from multiple observations and participant observation of daily life. This approach seeks to represent some aspect of social life or experience in terms of meanings, interpretation and definitions of situations (Agar, 1996). Another way to think of the goal of ethnography is to describe how social world members “make sense” of themselves, their actions and their worlds. Ethnography seeks to contextualize the actions and events found in the setting in terms of these meanings. As a form of fieldwork, ethnography depends on the skills and perception of the researcher to describe and analyze particular aspects, relations or phenomenon in the setting without losing sight of the whole. Classic ethnography involves extensive time “hanging out” in the field site. Key aspects of the ethnographic approach include naturalism, understanding and discovery; observing and interacting with other people in an everyday context and participating as part of the natural world (Spradley, 1980). Ethnography is also explicitly multi-method, combining several methods to create a comprehensive description of the setting or process of interest. In this study, structured observation, face-to-face interviews and document collection provide “triangulated” data that supports, verifies and compensates for the strengths and weaknesses of each method alone. While traditional ethnography focuses on culture and other normative structures, the data collection and analytic methods were used here to understand the overall impact of the census enumeration on the sampled facilities, how the context of the facilities shapes the census and how correctional staff involved with Census 2010 perceived the process over a stated period of time.

While ethnographic observation was proposed as the core of this project, there were few opportunities to make lengthy, naturalistic observations given the use of administrative rosters in all three primary sites. While an unobtrusive, non-participatory posture is always the goal of ethnography, the use of administrative rosters precluded any observation of inmate-enumerator interaction. Two observations were conducted: 1) correctional staff preparation for a cancelled Title 13 training; and 2) enumerator preparation for enumeration from administrative rosters at one site. A two-day observation was also conducted of a related operation, the American Community Survey – Group Quarters Interviews.

3.2 Individual Interviewing

Individual interviews, beginning with open-ended and unstructured interviews and concluding with targeted discussions post-enumeration were the primary source of this qualitative data. These ethnographic interviews have been described by Spradley (1980) as “taking a tour” through the subject or issue at hand, allowing the respondents to structure the content and identify salient factors in their account of the setting. These interviews were conducted prior to April 1, on Census Day and after the enumerations concluded in the facilities. Topical interviews elicited facts and sequences that surrounded all aspects of the census process. Evaluation interviews examined these events and processes retrospectively with the goal of constructing recommendations and identifying problems from the point of view of the respondent and their “native view.” These interview types focused on describing the experience and perspectives of the respondents.²

Multiple interviews with the primary facility liaisons were conducted at the two prisons and single jail site. A formal interview about the correctional agency experience with Census 2010 was conducted with a staff person at the agency main office and short interviews were conducted at two supplemental sites, a large male prison and a small women’s prison in another state. Protocols for the post-enumeration interviews appear in Appendix 2.

3.3 Purposive Site Selection

Purposive sampling was used in selecting the sites for this study and was based on the ability of the research team to access these secure sites quickly and efficiently. As one form of non-probability sampling, this purposive sampling relied on researcher’s knowledge of the environment, correctional culture, operational procedures and agency organization to choose the study sites. One prison and one jail were originally selected for observation as the research team had a history of working collaboratively with these facilities, and, equally important, had security clearance to enter these GQs. An additional prison was added as a third primary site with additional interviews conducted in correctional sites that emerged during the study. Sampling was not used to select interview subjects. At the primary sites, the five staff with direct responsibility for assisting Census Bureau staff with their work were interviewed multiple times. Single interviews were conducted with additional staff in the two observed prisons, agency administrators and prison staff in the secondary sites. One group interview was also conducted with two Census field staff.

3.4 Document Review

Ethnographic data collection can also include document review. As artifacts that capture process, relevant memoranda, letters and other documents generated by the corrections system that convey information relevant to the census were collected. We examined the “yellow folder” that census staff left with each facility at their initial meeting, the agency spreadsheet that recorded the approach in the 33 facilities and 13 camps in this state system and various printed

² Borrowing from the field of anthropology, ethnography often terms the interview participant as an “informant.” In correctional culture, an informant has a negative and pejorative meaning, indicating that the individual has “informed” or “snitched” to the authorities. The less value-laden terms of “participant” and “respondent” are more often used to avoid this implication.

administrative data records. Census Bureau operational documents, such as GQ training manuals and Group Quarter descriptions, were also reviewed.

3.5 Administrative Records, Rosters, and Alternative Enumeration

As anticipated by Jonas (2003), the size and structure of the three facilities observed in this project led to the use of administrative records (called rosters in correctional parlance) in the census enumeration. Rosters are routinely produced by correctional staff during normal operations but must be run as requested. These reports have multiple names and are produced in varying formats, but all are drawn from the same database. The liaisons indicated to the Census Bureau staff and the research team that these “real time” rosters were the only source of inmate data and could only be run on April 1. Prior to April 1, the correctional facility liaisons stated that they did not have the capacity to run a retrospective roster. Alternative enumeration documents were also collected to provide a check on the reliability and validity of the administrative rosters obtained by the census enumerators. Mid-April, we did learn that someone in the “I.T. Department” was able to run a report based on the population at a retrospective point in time and this document was used to enumerate the population in WP 1.

Prior to Census Day 2010, the prison and jail liaisons had been contacted by the census staff to determine the type of roster that would fit the requirements of the census process. After that determination had been made, research staff then arranged to collect two forms of administrative rosters from the three facility liaisons: (1) an exact copy of that to be provided to the census team and (2) an alternative roster that contained the same information on the inmates, run at the same time but in a different form. The two women’s prisons had decided on different types of reports for the census in their specific facility, so the requested alternative rosters were also different. The Jail liaison also indicated he understood the request and initially agreed to provide us two reports.

The research team visited the two prisons on the morning of April 1 and the Jail on April 2. We obtained the two rosters as requested at WP 1. At WP 2, the prison had not printed either report when visited by the research team. When reminded of our request to pick up both rosters, the WP 2 liaison contacted the appropriate office and printed both reports around 9:00 a.m.

The Jail, when visited on April 2, provided only one copy of the roster prepared for the census, and explained to us that there was no need to print the report in an alternative form as all the data would be the same regardless of the format.

In all, six different types of population reports were obtained by the research team. Only three (one in each facility) were used by census enumerators, as noted below:

WP 1

1. “Housing Unit Report” or “Alpha Roster” (printed around 12:01 a.m. on April 1, 2010 at WP1). Requested but not used by census enumerators who used report #3 for the actual enumeration.
2. “Inmate Roster Report” (printed around 12:01 a.m. on April 1, 2010 at WP1). Used as an Alternative Enumeration listing by study team.
3. “Retrospective Institution Census Report” (specially programmed & printed on April 19, 2010); used by census enumerators to conduct census.

WP 2

4. "Inmate Roster Report" (printed at 9:00 a.m. on April 1 at WP 2). Requested and used by census enumerators on April 12 during their enumeration.
5. "Housing Unit Report" or "Alpha Roster" (printed around 9:00 a.m. on April 1, 2010 at WP3). Used as an Alternative Enumeration listing by study team

County Jail

6. "Inmate Roster Report" (printed around 5:00 a.m. on April 1, 2010). This report was provided to the census enumerators and to the study team; it was also used for an off-site enumeration. No Alternative Enumeration report was provided.

3.6 Analysis

Qualitative data gathered from field notes, ethnographic observations, informal interviews and individual interviews were transcribed and prepared for content analysis, using inductive analysis and the principles of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Content analysis, the process of identifying, coding, categorizing the primary patterns in the data across individuals and groups (Berg, 2008), was conducted on the qualitative data. This approach has also been called the "constant comparative method," whereby preliminary themes are developed and data is continuously categorized and sifted, testing and fitting the data into themes in a comparative fashion until the observations are explained and "fit" into an explanatory scheme. This coding process resulted in the themes listed in the Findings section. A list of codes is contained in the Appendix 3.

3.7 Research Relationships

Our research team consists of an experienced criminologist as principal investigator, and two research associates with extensive experience in the correctional field. The PI has a long and continuous research relationship with the two prisons observed here. We have also conducted two studies in the jail setting in the past several years. Without these enduring research relationships, the research team would have had only formal and limited access to these study sites. Our reputation with the staff as "outsiders they can trust," support from the administrators, and knowledge of the data systems were crucial requirements in conducting this study. The facility contacts, particularly in the two prisons, were very comfortable with the members of the research team, which provided for open and unguarded conversations and access to their offices, conference rooms and databases. Although we did not observe any activities within the secure perimeter of the prison, the research team was cleared for un-escorted access to all inmate areas. While in the field, we were often asked questions about census process as a result of this long-term relationship and prior status as paid consultants to the system. Facility and agency staff asked us questions about the census that we did not answer due to our role as observers in this project. Such questions included queries about how other facilities were conducting the enumeration, and the different types of reports that would meet the census requirements. In reminding WP 2 of our need to get copies of the roster run for the enumerators and the alternative rosters, we did insert our research activities into the census process, resulting in the printing of two sets of rosters at our request. We later learned that when the Census Bureau staff contacted with the facility the second week in April, the roster printed on April 1 at our request

was used for their enumeration. We cannot speculate the course of action that would have developed post-Census Day to obtain a listing of the population as of April 1.

3.8 Limits

This study is presented within the confines of several limitations:

1. The three primary sites and three secondary sites, as in the case of purposive sampling, are not statistically representative of all correctional group quarters.
2. Although women's prisons made up two of the three primary sites, there was no observed gender effect in terms of data quality or the nature of the interaction in the facilities. Had the study or the enumeration included any direct interaction with inmates, gender-based differences potentially affecting data quality include responses rates, education/literacy levels and racial and ethnic subtexts would be possible.
3. An alternative enumeration of the Jail site was not made available to the research team, despite prior promises to do so.
4. While traditional ethnography involves immersion in the setting for lengthy periods of time, the specifics of the census time period created some limitations. These limitations however, are mediated somewhat by the principal investigator's long-term association with these facilities and knowledge of their environments and staff.

4 Results

The findings from this study are presented in five general areas: Census 2010 planning; the enumeration process; lessons from the American Community Survey; the utility of administrative rosters; and Census Coverage Measurement options.

4.1 2010 Census Planning

Multiple conversations were held with the facility liaisons about their initial contacts with the census staff to determine the nature of their planning process. These data were combined with that obtained in two observations and formal post-enumeration interviews. These aspects of the planning process shaped the quality of the enumeration data and the efficiency of the census process. The sections below describe these findings in detail.

4.1.1 "Top Down" Approach

In corrections, prison facilities typically take their lead from a centralized administration: thus a directive from headquarters is a critical first step. These agencies are hierarchical and take specific directions from the agency headquarters. In this case, the Director's office passed down the monitoring responsibility to the AD, who then assigned a clerical person, Ms J, who was relatively new to the agency to track the facility participation. Ms J then notified the wardens of the facilities of their role in completing this task. This notification also informed the facilities that this was a permissible information request. This step also directed the facilities to cooperate with the Census Bureau and gave them local responsibility to accomplish the enumeration. It should be noted here that the agency Director and the staff assigned to the task were fully

committed to working with the Census Bureau to accomplish this task. Monitoring and reporting was placed on the Associate Director's task list and thus required a weekly report to the Director in his weekly meeting. At headquarters, such an assignment is taken very seriously.

As directed by the agency headquarters, the facilities then saw this as part of their duties and were fully committed to completing the assignment. Within the facilities, the wardens, in their turn, directed an Associate Warden to supervise the task and they, in their turn, assigned the task appropriate staff to facilitate the Census 2010 process. This process can be characterized as passing the responsibilities from the top down. In the two primary observation sites, two staff persons were assigned the role as a team, with a Lieutenant, who, in their capacity as the public information officer (the PIO, who typically interacts with other agencies and well as the public and the media) as lead. Litigation Coordinators, who serve as back up to the PIO were also involved in the two women's prison sites.

In an interview prior to the enumeration, the facility contact at WP 2 said that he was "surprised that the Census Bureau doesn't have "a guru in agency HQ directing all the institutions how and what to do for the Census process." He also said that someone needed to tell the Census Bureau "here is how a prison count works."

4.1.2 Unrealistic Expectations and a Lack of Authority to Make Decisions

In all sites, the census contact first expressed a preference for inmate self-enumeration with the facility providing correctional staff to distribute, collect and process the ICR forms and their corresponding envelopes. WP 2 initially agreed to this approach, while WP 1 and the Jail determined early on that this would not be possible. This field note from early March describes the process at WP 1 in detail:

Lt. First indicated that he, along with LC 1, had been assigned the liaison role by the Warden. He said that he had been contacted by the Census Bureau enumerator both by phone and in-person in late February. At that meeting, he was given a "yellow folder" that outlined the requirements of the enumeration and was told that the Census preference was for the facility to hand out individual forms to individual inmates. At this initial contact, Lt. First told the census enumerator that this could not be done, due to the nature of the inmate population, their varying degrees of potential compliance and the need for custody staff supervision.

The census enumerator then referred L. F to her supervisor, saying she could not make the decision to not conduct a self-enumeration. After talking with to the LC 1, Lt. First said "we came up with the idea that staff could fill out the forms from the roster." He then contacted the census supervisor, and told him that directly dealing with the inmates "would not be accurate because of language issues, mental health issues and inmates that don't care." Other barriers to self-enumeration included the lack of staff to monitor the distribution of the forms and the impossibility of directly interviewing the thousands of inmates in the facility.

Lt. First then said that WP1 developed an approach to the enumeration that would include three steps:

- 1) Run the administrative roster with pertinent information on April 1;*
- 2) Find prison staff to fill out the ICR forms;*
- 3) Get training by the Census Bureau on how to fill out the forms and "confidentiality"*

He did wonder why prison staff had to be trained in confidentiality when prison staff handle inmate information every day in the course of their duties. Lt. First said that of the date of the interview, there were no further plans discussed and that he assumed the Census people would be contacting him to arrange the training session. He expressed confidence that the information in rosters would be sufficient to meet the census needs.

In later conversations, Lt. First informed the research team that the Census Bureau was scheduled to come out on April 5, 2010 to do the training. Arrangements were made to observe these training sessions. Lt. First noted that he heard that other institutions were “just handing over rosters” but that WP 1 was sticking with their plan to use their prison staff to fill out the forms.

Another facility contact recalled that census worker said “We were told you would conduct a self-enumeration” when she was told that the facility could not support the self-enumeration process. The census contacts then said they were not authorized to make arrangements for anything but self-enumeration and directed their respective facility liaisons to contact their supervisor to get authorization to base the enumeration on these records. Both WP 1 and the jail staff members reported a series of phone calls to a Census Bureau supervisor to develop a plan involving the use of administrative rosters. As one participant noted, the census contact said she was only a seasonal worker and did not have the authority to approve his proposal to use administrative rosters.

This additional step of putting the responsibility on the jail and prison staff to contact the supervisor was a source of mild irritation to correctional staff who typically act with clear knowledge of their authority to carry out assigned tasks and expect others to do so as well. The Jail liaison also indicted similar concerns about expectations of staff help, lack of knowledge of the census enumerators about correctional facilities and the need to contact a supervisor to finalize the use of administrative rosters. He was, however, able to finalize his planning process in March with no further contact with the Census Bureau, as described in this interview from March 18:

The Sergeant said that the Census Bureau representative came to him and gave him three packets—he assumed that he was given three packets because each of the three jail facilities has a separate physical address. The Census Bureau representative initially asked for the jail staff to complete the D-20 (ICR) form. This representative, he said, explained the process: the Census Bureau would send the jail 3,500 forms and envelopes (for each form to be sealed once completed).

The Sergeant said he objected to this approach and immediately made it clear that it was going to be highly unlikely that the jail agency would be able to support the staffing necessary to complete that task. He said it is unrealistic to expect correctional facilities to bear these costs. (due to budget restrictions’ and staff layoffs).

In reaction to his rejection of this suggestion, the Census Bureau representative stated that she would have to talk to her supervisor because she was unsure of the procedure. She stated that she was just a seasonal worker for the Census Bureau and that she did not have all the details that the supervisor would.

Pending this decision, the census representative requested that the Sergeant provide an administrative list of all the inmates to be run on April 1st to be given to the CB with the D-20 forms. The Sergeant said he replied that since he was nearly certain

that the facility would not be filling out the D-20 forms, it may be best that he simply supply them with the administrative record list (which has all of the items needed to fill out the D-20 form) and allow the Census Bureau to fill out the forms themselves somewhere else.

Again, according to the Sergeant, the representative did not know if that was going to be acceptable and suggested that would have to be worked out with the supervisor. The Sergeant then requested the phone number of the Census Bureau supervisor and stated that it would not be a problem for him to call the supervisor directly. In reply to a question about the flexibility of the representative, the Sergeant stated that the representative repeated that her instructions were that the jail staff was to complete the D-20 forms. The jail liaison said that the Census Crew Leader stated that these directives were “just what I have been told to do so...you can talk to my supervisor.” He also indicated that the representative was very polite but did not seem to have much understanding of the jail or the options available to the facility.

The Census Bureau representative stated that she or another representative would be at the facility on April 1st at approximately 0800 to pick up the administrative roster. The Sergeant explained that he would most likely run the report at around 0530 because there should be minimal inmate movement at that time. He also comes on his shift at 0600 so 0530 would be the closest time to his shift to run the roster with the best results. After this initial contact, the Sergeant assigned to this task said he discussed various options with his supervisors and they concluded that providing administrative records was the only feasible approach.

The next week, the Sergeant reported, he was contacted by the Census Bureau Supervisor who then suggested that census staff come into the jail to complete the D-20 forms in person with each inmate. The Sergeant explained that that was going to be a very difficult process as all the Census Bureau personnel would have to go through a Jail Clearance process. He then proposed again that the jail supply the rosters to the census workers only. At this time, the Sergeant said that the census Supervisor agreed to this approach. The Sergeant would supply the administrative roster and that would be the extent of the Census process for the jail.

When asked if the administrative data would provide information to complete the forms, the Sergeant stated that the supervisor seemed to be comfortable with the report because it had all the elements to complete the D-20 forms with one exception. The jail facility (like most correctional facilities in this state) considers Hispanic ethnicity to be a Race – unlike the Census Bureau. Yet, the supervisor was not concerned with that and stated that the way the facility recorded race was fine and would suffice for the CB records.

While we were unable to observe the enumeration process for any length of time, we note that form D-116, the Group Quarters Enumeration (GQE) listing sheet, asks for bed number. This requirement, to our knowledge, was never made clear to the staff.

4.1.3 Conflicting Perspectives Data Collection: Census Blocks vs. Facilities

Per legislative mandate, the Census Bureau worldview sees the geographic landscape in terms of individual census blocks, and “addresses” that define each correctional facility as

possessing one or more unique addresses to be contacted and enumerated. In this decentralized worldview, each site was defined as a standalone facility (sometimes with multiple addresses) and was contacted individually.

For facilities with multiple physical addresses, the enumerators asked for the population data in these address-based forms. Facility staff were puzzled at this request because they see their facility as a whole, not separate parts based on addresses or bed numbers. This was true of the two prisons and the jail. The jail liaison also recalled that the Census Bureau contact wanted the data by the physical addresses and then by bed number. He stated that he tried to tell the census contact that those things did not have any meaning because the populations are internally fluid: bed number and facility could change in the course of the day. This comment illustrates the conflict between the Census Bureau definition of a group quarters and the reality of correctional facility residence.

A very small definitional conflict was found in the misalignment of the term “housing unit.” The Census Bureau uses this term to denote individual “free world” residential units. Prison and jails typically call the buildings where inmates live “housing units.” While no misunderstanding was directly observed here, the possibility for miscommunication exists. In this report, the term “living unit” is used to denote what the correctional staff would label “housing units.”

4.1.4 Census Lack of Knowledge about Corrections and “Correctional Courtesies”

Correctional staff in the facilities and at the agency main office indicated that their census contacts had little knowledge about corrections, provided only general information and guidance about the census requirements, were often unable to answer their questions or make on the spot decisions about their plans and, in the prison settings, communicated poorly with the facilities after the initial contact. In one of the supplemental sites, for example, where census staff came to train prison staff in filling out the ICR forms, one interview participant said that the trainer “did not know anything about prisons” and that “we had to teach her about prisons.”³ The jail contact in a primary site made similar observations:

I would like the Census Bureau contact to know more about jails and how they operate. The {Census Bureau contact} should have more experience (with corrections). They need people who specialize in corrections. The Census Bureau was putting us in the same boat as hospitals (the GQ approach) and need to see how we are different.

This lack of knowledge included unrealistic expectations about security clearances, inmate movement within the facility and staff resources available to assist the census workers in their task. Those interviewed described several incidents characterized by the lack of “correctional courtesy,” words and actions that reflected little appreciation of staff time and efforts or insight into the professional standards of this hierarchical culture.

Prison staff were confused about “what the census wants,” particularly when the census Crew Leader rejected the printed alpha rosters at the point of the enumeration at WP 1 and asked for another report.

³ She also noted that the census worker “did not bring anything. We had to give her pencils and tape. She didn’t have anything” to do her work.

4.1.5 Cooperation then Frustration

Despite these emerging conflicts in perspective, an attitude of cooperation and desire to meet the needs of the 2010 Census was expressed by all participants in the early stages of the planning process. Jail and prison staff approached their assignments professionally and devoted significant time to developing their plan. This idea was also voiced by the agency person, Ms J, tracking the census process in the prison agency main office. In an interview prior to April 1, she said that there was “no real resistance” from the facilities—and that “everyone knew that they had to comply” and that “most everyone was compliant” but there was significant variation in the process of interacting with the Census Bureau. Ms. J confirmed the observations we found in the facilities. She told us that some facility liaisons reported to her that Census Bureau did not call them back, or that Census Bureau staff could not answer their questions and said they had to check with their supervisors. Ms J indicated in her interview that several facilities called her with questions of the process but that she was unable to answer them. As an example, the Agency Tracker contacted the Census Bureau to ask if administrative rosters met the legal requirements and no one was able to answer her. She said she made one more call but again no one could answer her on this second try. Ms J indicated that this left her feeling that there was no resolution and had no answer to offer to the facility contacts when they called in with the same question. In the prisons, their initial cooperative attitude turned to frustration as Census Day 2010 grew nearer and Census staff failed to follow through with their initial plans and did not contact the prisons anytime during the week of April 1.

4.1.6 For Prisons, an Agency Worldview and a Desire for a Standardized Protocol

In comparison to the regional and decentralized perspective of the Census Bureau, prison correctional staff see their world from a more centralized agency-wide perspective. This decentralized planning process of the Census Bureau conflicted with the more centralized administrative perspective of the prison staff, and in their view, resulted in an unnecessary burden on the local facilities. In the prison settings, agency coordination was minimal and had little effect on the facilities in this large state prison system. One prison staff commented that the letter from their agency main office was “very general” and “there were a lot of unknowns.” After the state correctional agency notified each of the over 50 facilities that they were authorized to cooperate with Census 2010, each census regional office sent a census worker to the individual prison to plan the census process. There was no further involvement with the correctional agency main office beyond tracking these individual plans. Such an agency approach would have also resulted in a more systematic and consistent approach than was observed in the two prison facilities.

When asked about how the planning was going, there was a consensus that, within the state correctional agency, the process should have been guided by a written, standardized protocol and that agency- rather than facility- data-bases should have been the source of the administrative rosters. This point of view was reflected in the field notes from an interview with a clerical staff person. Ms J, who was tracking the census process at headquarters:

Ms. J remarked that there seemed to be no consistency among the Census Bureau enumerators based on the descriptions provided by the facility liaisons in their weekly updates. She expressed some surprise that there was no single protocol and that the

Census Bureau workers seemed to each have an individual approach as reflected in the weekly updates and the kind of questions that she was asked. She said she responded to facility questions by telling them that they had to get an answer from their Census Bureau contacts.

Given that the agency maintains a system-wide database, Ms J raised the question of using this database to provide the information across the entire agency. She wondered why the Census Bureau did not consider the possibility of using {their main database programmers} to print rosters and then distribute them from a central location. Ms. J did ask research staff why nobody had thought of an electronic database collection—research staff replied that they were learning about this as well and could not answer her questions.

In wondering why each facility had to develop a unique plan and provide the data locally, the local prison staff expressed the same point of view, as seen in this field note from an interview with the census contact at one of the secondary sites:

Lt. Sixty also discussed the various databases that were in the planning stage and suggested that, in the future, the Census might be able to draw on these more detailed and more sophisticated databases. He concluded the discussion by musing about why this was done individually at each facility, and suggested that doing it system-wide would be much more efficient.

That is, the prison contacts felt that the data necessary for the census enumeration was more efficiently and consistently available through the agency databases. The data on individual inmates, they believe, is the same regardless of where it is located. Working on an individual facility level (as dictated by the census geographic worldview) was a waste of time and conflicted with their data perspective. Prison staff felt that agency data management staff could have programmed the rosters, printed in order by institution, in a single project without the duplication of effort created by the decentralized approach. The individualized planning process, as it was based out of different census regional and local offices throughout this state, resulted in separately negotiated plans that were inconsistent across the system. Although originating in an agency database, individual facility reports are possible.

Working in a hierarchical and quasi-military organization, correctional staff expect consistent, written protocols in agency-wide tasks. When this expectation was not met due to the lack of a standardized protocol, facility staff interpreted this as a lack of clarity of purpose. Our interview with the state correctional agency coordinator revealed that, on the agency level, over ten different approaches to the enumeration were planned throughout the over 50 facilities in this large agency. At the three prison sites observed here, three entirely different approaches were initially developed by the prison staff: rosters only (the supplemental site of the male prison); prison staff completing the ICR forms after Title 13 training (WP 1); and using inmates to distribute and collect census forms with prison staff supervision (WP 2). Except for tracking these plans, the agency main office had no input in coordinating the enumeration planning. Staff in these sites felt they were “left on their own” to develop a plan with little guidance.

4.1.7 Three Different Plans, One Final Outcome

Each prison site had developed, without much input from the census contact, individual plans to complete the enumeration, using staff and inmate labor. WP 1 intended to use facility clerical staff to complete the ICR forms, based on an administrative roster run on the early morning of April 1. This plan included a Title 13 training session to be provided to the prison staff by Census Bureau staff prior to the enumeration activities. The WP 1 liaison was fairly pleased with this approach and had arranged for clerical workers to be released from their normal duties for a one-day training session on April 5 and other days necessary to complete the ICRs for the over 3,500 women listed on the April 1 roster. Even when he learned that other facilities were only providing the rosters to meet their obligation, the WP 1 Liaison was determined to keep his commitment to providing staff to complete the enumeration.

A more elaborate – but less developed – plan involving inmates and staff was proposed at WP 2. As described to us prior to April 1, their plan was to allow the inmates to self-enumerate with custody staff supervising inmate members of an inmate organization (similar to a student body governing organization in a high school) to distribute and pick up the ICR forms on April 1. WP 2 had also agreed to provide an automated records roster.

Questions about third-party inmates handling ICR forms and how the forms were to be reconciled with the roster were not raised. This plan included Title 13 training for staff but not inmates. Lt. Second and the other staff liaison at WP 2 expected further communication from the census staff, but had not received any further contact or materials as of April 1, when the research team met with them to pick up the rosters.

The jail only agreed to provide administrative rosters and asked that the enumeration be conducted away from the prison. Of the three plans, this was the only one that was carried through as designed. All three facilities were enumerated from administrative records by Census Bureau staff.

4.2 The Enumeration: Census Day 2010 and Beyond

4.2.1 “Where is the Census Bureau?”

Unlike the jail, which was contacted by the census worker the day before in order to confirm their arrangements, the prison liaisons reported no contact with census staff after their initial planning. The two prisons were visited by the research team the morning of April 1 to pick up copies of the rosters requested by the census worker and the requested alternative enumeration roster. As mentioned earlier, WP 1 had prepared these rosters as requested (printing them in the early hour of 12:01 a.m.) but WP 2 had not printed the reports at the same time as previously agreed. When reminded of our request to pick up both rosters, the WP 2 liaison contacted the custody office and had both reports printed around 9:00 a.m., about nine hours later. However, in reviewing the two sets of rosters obtained by the research team, the original roster that was printed at 9:00 a.m. , which was apparently used by the enumerating team when they visited WP 2 later in the month, was different from the alternative enumeration report that was printed at the same time, at our request. The research team speculates that the report requested by the census, and represented as the one given to the census workers, did not contain information about one unit, the Reception Center, which held almost 700 inmates. The

originally requested roster lists 2,871 inmates and the alternative enumeration roster lists 3,546, resulting in an undercount at WP 2.

As we were reviewing the reports at WP 2 the morning of April 1 (but did not comment on the undercount), the liaison for WP 2 began to discuss his immediate attitude toward the census. In telling us that he had had no contact with the Census Bureau for several weeks, the WP 2 liaison began to express his rising frustration by saying “we have no forms, no training. I thought that had all been arranged.” The WP 2 Liaison further indicated that he felt “we were doing our part” and that they were “left hanging” by the Census Bureau. He further noted that “it was April 1, the big day, why haven’t I heard from Census?”

The WP 2 Liaison then said this lack of contact was causing him to re-think his commitment to the original plan and that now “we are getting impatient because of no contacts.” The liaison from WP 2 decided, in the research team’s presence, that he was now “considering not using inmates.” After some thought, the WP 2 contact made the decision to “call the Census Bureau and tell them just to pick up rosters,” as he had heard other facilities were doing. He concluded our conversation by saying that no facility staff or inmates would now be involved in helping the Census Bureau. The enumeration in WP 2 then took place with census enumerators traveling to the facility and completing the forms over a one-week period later in the month.

4.2.2 The Planned Title 13 Training and Miscommunications

As described above, Women’s Prison 1 (WP 1) had developed a plan for the enumeration that involved prison staff completing the ICRs from the administrative record roster that was printed on April 1, 2010. The Census Bureau Enumerator had informed WP 1 liaison, Lt. First, that these prison staff must be trained on Title 13 issues in order to complete ICRs. While Lt. First later wondered why prison staff had to be trained to handle data they accessed every day, he agreed to this request and arranged to have six clerical staff available for both the training and the actual enumeration. He reserved a conference room for this training to take place on April 5, 2010. These arrangements, he said, were made with the Census Bureau enumeration Crew Leader.

At WP 1, the correctional contact had printed the roster as requested on April 1 and prepared for the Title 13 Training as planned at 10:00 a.m. on April 5. Six clerical staff and the research team assembled to participate in the Census Bureau training in preparation for the actual enumeration. The prison clerical staff were to begin completing the ICR forms and were detailed to this duty for the next several days. At 10:15 a.m., there was no sign of the Census Bureau trainers. The WP 1 liaison began to wonder aloud why the Census Bureau staff had not arrived and said he would start making phone calls to locate his Census Bureau contact person. Over the next half-hour, the WP 1 liaison continued to ask rhetorically “Where is the Census Bureau?” Around 10:30 a.m., the WP 1 liaison told all assembled that the Census Bureau “was not coming.” Clearly exasperated, he directed the clerical workers to return to their regular duty stations and called the research team into his office to discuss his mounting frustration. Details of this conversation are reflected in this section of the field notes:

Lt. First expressed his extreme frustration and apologized to the research team for “wasting our time.” The research team assured Lt. First that this was not a waste of time; and that “it is part of our job to observe these events, however they turn out.”

Lt. First then invited the research team to his office. Behind closed doors, Lt. First, who is very comfortable with the research team, went into detail about his frustration with the Census Bureau at this point. He was clearly agitated that he had used his time and facility resources to make the arrangements for the Title 13 training.

Lt. First then reviewed his conversations with the Census Bureau contact. He appeared to be offended as he described the census worker's "lack of professionalism" and said that she "did not take any responsibility" for the cancellation. Lt. First also indicated that the Census Bureau contact demonstrated a lack of understanding about how prisons work and stated that "she acted like we caused the problem," and that she did not apologize or acknowledge that "she had dropped the ball."

Lt. First then said that the census contact said they were not coming to the prison that day because "the census was too busy." He seemed to be particularly taken aback at one remark: Lt. First reported that the census contact said that her supervisor was "very over-worked" and, according to his impression, "could not be bothered with this issue."

Lt. First stated that the Census Bureau representative said she would "have to get back" to Lt. First to set up a new schedule. No dates were discussed.

In further conversation, Lt. First continued to state that he was very unhappy with this situation. He expressed his feelings that all his work to arrange this "was for nothing" and now he had to spend time making new arrangements. As he continued to vent, Lt. First showed the research team his notes for making the arrangements that confirmed the original plan to conduct the Title 13 training session on April 5. In reviewing his timeline and contact with the Census Bureau, it appeared that Lt. First wanted to assure himself that he had followed procedures and to figure out what went wrong. Lt. First related that he had tried to "do the right thing" and was disappointed that all this time, again, was "for nothing" as he continued to express "what waste of effort this had been." The research team then returned to the conference room to look over the administrative rosters and discuss the project.

At 11:45 a.m., Lt. First returned to the conference room to discuss his last contact with the Census Bureau. He said that the Census Bureau representative continued to "act like this was his problem to solve." Lt. First described his conversation with the census contact and that he told her that he had now changed his mind about providing prison staff to complete the census forms. Lt. First said he told the census contact that "now we would prefer the Census Bureau to do it" and was now unwilling to devote prison staff to the enumeration process. The Census Bureau representative then said that, in order for the Census Bureau to conduct the enumeration, they now needed to come into the prison for "5 or 6 days and needed space to work." Lt. First also said that the Census Bureau contact gave him the impression that she now thought the enumerators would be interviewing inmates directly. He did not think she grasped the fact that they were using rosters to fill out forms. No dates or further arrangements were made. By this time, he was pretty frustrated and wanted to get back to his duties.

The research team again thanked him for all his cooperation and agreed to stay in contact regarding the next step.

Arrangements were later made for census enumerators to travel to the facility later in April to enumerate the facility.

The census enumerating team later arranged to visit the facility the week of April 19- 23. The prison liaison dutifully made plans to provide space for the enumerators. However, once the lead census worker reviewed the requested roster printed on April 1, she informed him that the report printed on April 1 was insufficient to the enumeration purpose. The WP 1 liaison described this in a post-enumeration interview:

I was bugged that the Census Bureau worker looked at the administrative roster and then asked for a different kind of report than they had originally requested. I thought it was odd that they wanted a roster with specific bed numbers because they never asked for this before.

The WP 1 Liaison was able to procure a second report during their enumeration period that met census needs (report #3 described earlier).

Additionally, the WP 1 Liaison reported to us during the post-enumeration interview that one male enumerator behaved unprofessionally while in the facility, by making inappropriate comments to female staff. He indicated that he had to ask the Crew Leader to address this problem with her staff, which he said seemed to solve the problem.

4.3 Reflections on the 2010 Census

Face-to-face interviews about the census experience were conducted with the jail liaison immediately after the Census Bureau collected the inmate roster on April 2, 2010 and, in the two women's prison settings, well after the enumeration was completed on-site in early May.

4.3.1 The Staff Experience

The prison liaisons expressed an over-all attitude of relief that the census process was completed. Prison staff in the two locations felt "disrespected" by these changing plans and lack of follow-through. "Census fatigue" was quite obvious during the post-enumeration interviews. The experience of the jail was less problematic in that the Jail liaison had much less contact with the Census Bureau and had arranged to provide administrative rosters early in the process. All prison staff members interviewed supported an agency approach that omitted facility involvement. Two also discussed the evolution of the agency data and the idea that the new databases would have much more detail, especially "on the ethnicity."

In stating, "I have had my share of this census stuff," the Lt. First further reflected that the census workers "could have just picked up the roster" and "have left the institution out of the whole thing and just worked with the I. T. Department." He repeated that "they really wasted our time" and wondered "why did they have to do it locally?" Lt. First was particularly frustrated that "all the telephone calls and the face-to-face time was just a waste."

The second WP 1 liaison, however, had some very specific comments about the enumeration. When the first WP 1 liaison was explaining how the Census Bureau spent their time, the second WP 1 liaison jumped in and said, "Why did it take so long to fill those forms out?" He continued in saying that he felt the Census Bureau staff were "goldbricking" and that the Census Bureau workers told him they were hourly workers and that they "needed the work." In noting the census workers were at the facility for four hours, the second WP 1 liaison concluded by asking, "Why did they not work eight hours like everybody else?"

The problem with the Census Bureau request to get bed numbers after April 1 was again mentioned with the first Lt. First wondering, “Why didn’t they tell us before?” The second liaison then questioned the planning process. He asked, “Who came up with this plan—telling the prison they had to figure out how to do this?”

When asked about any problems they had with Census 2010, Lt. Second, the liaison from WP 2 said that “the census workers were difficult at times to work with” and that “at the start, when the census workers were not able to answer some questions the facility staff needed answered in order to prepare.” He would have appreciated more options and guidelines for how things needed to be set up for census and that the most positive thing about the overall process was that, once the rosters were printed, “It was very good that the census workers did all of the work without much need for help of any kind. It had a low impact on the facility.”

The post-enumeration interviews with both WP 2 liaisons indicated that their original plan was problematic and “would not have worked.” When asked about the original plan to use inmates to hand out census forms, Lt. Second, one of the WP 2 liaisons, replied that inmate self-enumeration “would have been unreliable, difficult, and inaccurate to have the inmates fill out the forms. It would have taken far too many man-hours and resources.” In response to a question about having census workers interview the inmates directly, the second WP 2 liaison said he could “not even imagine how that could work. There is no way that would have been feasible because of time, logistics, security, and everything else.”

The Jail had minimum contact with the census staff after the back and forth process of planning how to provide the data through administrative records. While indicating satisfaction with the overall process, he thought the original census contact should have had more knowledge about jails and should have not “put the responsibility of contacting her supervisor on me” and that these issues should have been worked out before contacting the jail. He said that, “The process should be smoother. It was not that bad but there should be more discussion of the different possibilities of getting the data beforehand.”

4.3.2 Census Staff Experience

Attempts were made to arrange interviews with the two Census Bureau Crew Leaders responsible for the enumeration in the jail and two prison sites. The census contact for the two prisons was unavailable so one interview was conducted with the Jail Crew Leader. This interview sought to describe the Census 2010 process from the perspective of the census contact and addresses several areas: initial contact with the jail, deciding how the enumeration would be conducted and the enumeration process itself. Arrangements were made to meet with the census contact in the local Census Office: when the research team arrived, a supervisor joined the interview. Her input was a welcome addition to the interview.

The primary contact with the jail related an experience similar to that of the jail liaison, described above. She related how the possible approaches to the enumeration were discussed with the jail liaison. While both self-enumeration and direct interaction with the inmates were discussed as possibilities, the problems with self-enumeration by the inmates and with Census Bureau staff receiving clearances and arranging space in the jail itself made this approach less desirable from the jail’s point of view. The supervisor noted that planning was a process that typically involved negotiations to “best meet each party’s needs.”

4.4 The American Community Survey

In direct contrast, a two-day observation of the American Community Survey Field Representatives (FRs) at two other correctional facilities demonstrated the potentials of a written and standardized protocol, executed with an obvious understanding of the required correctional courtesies and the overall correctional context. While understanding the difference between an on-going and reoccurring project and the one-shot decennials, these are some lessons to be learned from their approach to working in correctional facilities.

Despite the demands of working in a correctional environment and the need for both flexibility and adherence to both Census Bureau and prison procedures, the ACS was conducted professionally and efficiently. The relationship between the facility liaison and the FRs contributed significantly to the success of this ACS process. The facility liaison was highly-informed about the ACS and Census 2010, pointing to the importance of developing a relationship with consistent staff. The facility liaison was informed, experienced, organized and well-prepared for the visit.

The FR staff, in turn, exhibited high standards of professionalism and correctional courtesy and clearly knew their way around the prison environment. The interviewers displayed the ability to develop rapport with a highly variable population and demonstrated strong general interview skills: e.g. restating the question, paraphrasing answers and encouraging continued response. At the end of most interviews, the FRs concluded with a polite statement (e.g. “take care of yourself”) and thanked the inmate participant for their time and cooperation.

Particularly noteworthy was their ease of interaction with a correctional population. Even in the high security units, the FRs were appropriately friendly and professional in their interaction with the inmates. They explained the purpose of the ACS and their role as census workers, stressing the confidentiality of their information and how it would be used. Subjectively, we would add that their approach to prison inmates made the respondents feel, at least for the moment, like American citizens rather than incarcerated prisoners. They struck the right note of respect and interest, clearly resulting in the very high response rate among a typically resistant interview population.

Although there was some confusion over the 2010 Census and the on-going American Community Survey (ACS) in the women’s prison sites, the prison and jail staff assigned to coordinating the ACS were generally pleased with their interaction with ACS Census Field Representatives (FRs). The correctional staff who worked with the ACS stated that the FRs understood the time necessary to secure their clearances, arrange for inmate interviews and obtain private space for the ACS interviews. The FRs and the prison liaisons appear to have established smooth working relationships over the course of administering the ACS. During the Census 2010 observation period, one incidence of the ACS FRs ignoring the correctional courtesies was described to the research team. In this example, one prison site liaison expressed frustration with the ACS process when the FR asked to come in the prison to conduct the ACS interviews the next day without regard for the established timeframes. The prison ACS liaison told the ACS FR that they could not come in without sufficient notice and declined to make these hurried-up arrangements. Outside of this exception, all prison and jail contacts reported satisfactory relationships with the ACS process. This is in direct contrast to the Census 2010 census workers who had no relationship with the facilities and did not appear to develop an understanding of the prison and jail operations or culture.

4.5 Using Administrative Records

In these observations, the two prison sites changed course and joined the jail site in only providing administrative records for the enumeration. The Jail enumeration was conducted by a team of census enumerators away from the jail, as initially planned. The enumerations in the prisons were conducted by teams of enumerators at the prisons, but outside its secure perimeter.

4.5.1 Confidence in Administrative Records when Combined with System Knowledge

Our findings suggest that the Census Bureau may have a high degree of confidence in the comprehensiveness of the listing when the correct report is obtained. Correctional facilities, after all, exist to incarcerate inmates and, equally important, confirm and track their exact whereabouts within the facility several times a day. These counts are confirmed a minimum of three times a day (often more) and must be reconciled to “clear the count.” When the count does not clear, inmate movement within the facility is suspended until the physical counts match the roster counts precisely.

However, for census coverage purposes, the administrative report used for the enumeration must be a true listing of the entire facility. The strengths of an agency approach appear to outweigh the potential error and duplication of effort in the present decentralized approach. Given inadequate knowledge of data systems and their reports, the single-visit approach observed here in the women’s prisons without followup was inadequate to establish a reliable method to obtain comprehensive rosters.

In spite of these issues, we conclude that these different plans and their revisions had little effect on the enumeration in terms of count except where incomplete rosters were used. This incomplete roster was not an artifact of the rosters themselves. Primarily due to lack of follow-up and communication between the two prison sites and the census contact,⁴ these plans were abandoned as the prison contacts, separately and on different days, withdrew their offers of staff support in the actual enumeration. As the section below outlines, complete administrative rosters have some significant advantages, but they, too, have their limits.

There is, however, some question about the use of home addresses obtained from official records. A separate study of the availability and accuracy of these records would have to be designed and implemented.

4.5.2 Duplication Errors

Although we were not able to compare two different rosters in the Jail, we can speculate about the potential for enumeration problems in jail settings. Duplications in enumerating jail populations are possible, given the potential overlap of community and jail status in these populations. Administrative rosters cannot address questions about “Usual Housing Elsewhere.” Given the extreme fluidity of the jail population, especially in terms of jail intakes based on arrests, duplication in records and questions about residence arise in this particular group

⁴ We did learn, after April 1, that WP 1 and WP 2 had the same Census Bureau contact. We cannot speculate how individual work styles, personalities, or workloads contributed to this lack of contact. The jail census contact was out of a different local office but we cannot compare the process between the jail and the prisons because the jail had always planned to provide administrative rosters only. As the planning processes were more involved at the prison, comparing the jail and the prison in this regard has little utility.

quarters population. Duplicate records potentially exist because individuals who returned housing unit (residential) census forms because they typically “eat and sleep” at their own residence, and who were arrested and booked into the Jail immediately prior to the April 1 print date would be enumerated in both places.

It is unlikely that duplications in individual records would be found in the two prison sites. Even though rosters were printed at different times, there would have been no movement of the population from one facility to another during that time. It is also unlikely than any new admissions or releases occurred at that time.⁵

4.5.3 Accuracy in Race and Ethnic Categories

While it is unlikely that any inmate names would be omitted from a comprehensive facility roster, missing or misinterpreted demographic data remains a possibility. In addition to the expected problems of missing data in any administrative data set, data collected for this project suggested that racial and ethnic identities listed by the correctional facilities were mismatched with census categories (e.g. defining “Hispanic” and “Mexican” as a race); abbreviations were subject to misinterpretation in the absence of a protocol defining three-letter abbreviations; and field length limits in printed rosters truncated full names.

These critical issues are inter-related. Minority and other disadvantaged groups are disproportionately confined to correctional facilities. Undercounting women and men in these correctional facilities is likely to have an impact on the count of racial and ethnic subpopulations at all levels of the census metric. Likewise, incorrect enumeration of racial or ethnic categories would have a similar effect. The large prison system observed in this study used only one variable, “ethnicity,” instead of separate race and ethnic categories. (Note that this is a problem particular to many; most correctional agencies see “Hispanic” or “Mexican” as a race, rather than as an ethnicity as defined at the Federal level.) A quick review of the “ethnicity” field listed in the inmate roster of WP 1 reveals the following categories:

AMI	IND	OTH
CHI	KOR	PI
CUB	LAO	PR
FIL	MEX	SAM
HIS	OA	VIE

⁵ Although not affecting these facility-based counts, there is another source of potential error in correctional facility enumerations. Large prison systems have many inmates “in-transit” at any given time, sleeping in temporary prisons until they reach their destination. These inmates are often processed out of the transit facility where they slept and moved as early as 0400 or 0500. Although few inmates would have likely been “on a bus” at 12:01 a.m., it is possible that rosters printed a few hours later would not contain the names of those inmates placed on a bus and transported out of the facility had they been processed out of the facility in the early morning hours. So, an inmate processed into the facility roster the previous day would appear on a roster printed at 12:01 a.m., but would be removed from the database once processed out when placed on the bus and not appear on the roster when printed several hours later. There is little lag in these inputs; they occur very close to the time the inmate physically leaves the facility. It would be possible to obtain a list of these transfers, listed “hour by hour” on the movement sheet if one knew to ask for that information. Although most facilities do not archive this data locally, this information is printed in hard copy each day and may be available through specific requests of agency database programmers.

The subjectivity and unreliability of interpretation and possibility of data entry error is obvious. The listing of any one of these categories is subject to a range of subjective errors. We observed no instance of interpretation of these categories by the census staff. Instead, the brief observation of the enumeration at WP 2 and the comments of the Jail Crew Leader indicate interpretation of these abbreviations was negotiated by the enumerating team independently at each site. In the observation at WP 2, the Crew Leader instructed the enumerators to look at the roster and begin filling in the name and DOB as listed. The enumerators were also told to extrapolate race category from the roster. She noted that some of the racial categories used by the prison may need to be converted into the Census Bureau categories. We noted that there was not a rubric or standardized way to approach this conversion. In a particular example, one enumerator responded that she noticed that the roster included AMI under the race category and didn't know what that "stood for." There was some discussion among the group which came to the consensus that AMI indicated "American Indian." The Crew Leader stated something to the effect of "that sounds right." Then the same enumerator said "what is FIL?" Again the group talked around the table and came up with "Filipino." The Crew Leader didn't respond with approval or disapproval at this suggestion. These independent negotiations as to how to list race and ethnicity variables, it can be speculated, introduced errors into the census data wherever census categories were inconsistent with those in the administrative records.

When asked about any problems in filling out the ICRs from the Jail roster, a Crew Leader enumerating that roster recounted similar experiences with reconciling the roster information on race and ethnicity with the census categories as printed on the ICR. In addition to the negotiated definition issues, this Crew Leader also described the difference between an official definition of race and ethnicity and one determined by each individual. She noted that when individuals "self-enumerate," each person has the opportunity to either choose among the existing options on the ICR or fill in their own term. Self-reporting, she felt, provided a "more accurate reflection" of race and ethnicity. Using the rosters, she continued, forces the census enumerators completing the forms to answer the race question only according to how each facility categorized them.

4.5.4 Accuracy of Names

The Jail Crew Leader also identified another problem with the rosters involving the full name of some individuals. The roster only provided for a specific number of characters and some individual inmate names were truncated on the roster to fit the length of the field. She said these missing letters sometimes resulted in incomplete names on the ICR. The truncations have potential bias: Longer names are likely to be hyphenated names of both parents used in specific ethnic groups and those of married women who use both their paternal and marital last names.

4.6 Census Coverage Measurement Study in Correctional Settings

This section explores questions surrounding Census Coverage Measurement and discusses the possibility of a second enumeration of same population in correctional settings and explores what would be learned from a CCM in correctional settings.

4.6.1 A Comparative Approach to a Second Enumeration

The short answer to the question of a second enumeration of correctional group quarters is a qualified “yes.” The most promising option would involve a comparison between agency-level, archival databases of administrative records (using retrospective data) and the actual population listing from April 1 used for the decennial enumeration. If a retrospective database of administrative records was not used, using the “real-time data” base at two divergent points in time would be extremely problematic and, in our view, would have diminished utility given the dynamics of the population. This would require a careful examination of the reason for the discrepancies between the two listings. A second enumeration of the same facility population (using facility “real time” data and not the retrospective agency database) would require the resolution of many discrepancies not related to capture and recapture. These discrepancies would not necessarily indicate a problem in the original enumeration; rather, they would reflect the normal ebb and flow of correctional populations. Resolving these discrepancies would require a significant and unique exploration of multiple minute factors and may not provide a useful evaluation of the actual Decennial enumeration.

The comparative approach analyzing differences between the agency archival database and the April 1 enumeration would involve careful planning with those correctional staff highly familiar with the pertinent databases. The most appropriate and productive avenue would most likely be a direct involvement of agency main office research or population management staff. Jails and prisons would require a different approach to a CCM study, based on the nature of their administration and availability of automated, retrospective databases. In both settings, local facility staff would be unlikely to provide the programming necessary to a CCM study using retrospective automated data. In the jail studied here, we were unable to determine the appropriate person who would be able to access retrospective data, although we were told it might be possible. In the prison settings, we were told that such a follow-up study would be possible at the agency level. With some exceptions, the local facility would not be the optimal access point for such a study.

A re-enumeration, using agency databases and collaborating with agency population managers, researchers or the like, would be possible in prison systems with archival or retrospective databases. The data obtained through these retrospective databases could then be compared with the enumeration conducted in each individual facility.

An agency-wide approach, rather than facility-based, would have multiple advantages. State and Federal prison systems have varying degrees of sophistication in data analyses, but all use extensive automated systems in tracking their inmates. Large sample sizes would also be possible. In the case of the state studied in this project, a capture and recapture procedure for the entire system of 170,000 inmates could be conducted, providing a large sample for statistical analysis. This would also be true of many other state prison systems and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Finally, cross-national comparisons could also be conducted when multiple prison systems participated in the study.

With a decentralized administration, a CCM study of a jail GQ would require an individual facility-based approach. In the jail examined here, the jail contact was unfamiliar with the potential for capturing retrospective data. As the jail contact noted, this system had recently been introduced to the jail and its analytic possibilities were only partially understood. As jails are administered locally, each jail system would require a separate study to determine the availability, accessibility and utility of retrospective data systems. Size matters here. Large jail

systems, like Los Angeles or Cook County (IL), would likely have experienced data analysts and programmers on staff and possess the skills to conduct a re-enumeration of the April 1 population with automated data.

4.6.2 Double Duty: Census Coverage Measurement and the 2020 Census

In all settings, a CCM study would require planning beyond that done at the study sites for the Census 2010 enumeration. Study planners would work closely with each system to identify the appropriate data system contact and collaboratively determine all the possible approaches to meet CCM requirements. Local facility staff, rightly concerned with operational rather than research issues, would be highly unlikely to possess this information or these skills. There are also data purge requirements that may limit the utility of the local databases, providing more support for an agency-wide approach for a CCM study in prison settings. This planning should occur no later than two years before the study would begin.

These CCM studies could conceivably form the basis for experimenting with accessing these correctional databases for the 2020 Census. Working closely with database experts at the prison agency level may have some collateral benefits for future census enumerations. Census Bureau researchers would gain greater insights into the structure, content and utility of these data systems. These data systems are often redesigned and refined as software and system needs evolve. In California, for example, an extensive redesign of the state correctional agency database is underway. As these systems are redesigned, information required by the decennial enumeration, and equally important, the format of these data, could potentially be programmed into these databases. As the current observations and interviews have demonstrated, Census 2010 enumerators had to reconcile the race and ethnicity fields listed in the rosters with different categories as required by the ICRs. Working directly with database designers could conceivably reconcile these differences on an agency or system level, rather than by the individuated and potentially idiosyncratic approach observed in this study.

4.6.3 A Less Desirable Approach: Analysis of Admittance and Release Reports

Another approach would involve collecting, coding and analyzing the daily admittance and release report, and tracking the releases during the time period between April 1 and the CCM data, however, it is not clear that such a detailed data project would confirm that each individual, in fact, lived in the facility on April 1. This approach is not recommended. As discussed earlier, there are many factors that create two very different populations in any given correctional facility on April 1 and the CCM designated day. The inmates present on April 1 would be very different than those present at the end of the month or later. For both settings, a CCM could obtain the same type of administrative report (run on the day designated for the CCM) and compare it to that collected on April 1. Determining the reasons for these different lists would require an analysis of the releases post- April 1 as well as exclude those who were admitted after April 1. The list would differ both by individuals who were there in April but not present in CCM period (releases and transfers out) and new people who were not present on April 1 but residing in facility now (daily admissions and transfers in). Also complicating the picture would be those released and returned either through a new offense (jail); or a parole violation (prison) but who did not reside in facility in between the two measurement periods. The admissions and releases

in a given week (much less across several months) would be extremely volatile and difficult to reconcile.

Given that, in some cases, the Census Bureau sees one facility (administratively) as encompassing several different addresses, there is also the problem of internal transfer. Inmates – in both the jail and the prison – move within the facility very frequently. An inmate could move from a reception unit (where they lived on April 1) to a general population unit (where they lived on the CCM day) which would create a discrepancy that would be difficult to unravel. Inmates are also moved in and out of medical housing and disciplinary housing with some frequency. These situations would produce different “bed numbers” in each living unit but the inmate really did not move out of the facility.

Jails have an extremely high rate of turnover. The three types of inmates held in any jail would have different rates of turnover. Pretrial and pre-sentenced inmates, who make up 60-80 percent of the jail population would have the highest turnover. Sentenced inmates and the boarder inmates (State and Federal inmates held in jail for many reasons) would have different other rates that would be equally difficult to calculate.

Another small point: On any given day, thousands of inmates are being transported from one correctional facility to another. These inmates are on the move. At midnight on any given day, they most likely would be sleeping in a “hold-over” cell, at a prisons or jail (as they do not transport inmates at night), and may show up on the roster of a given facility, but this is not where they “usually eat or sleep.”

4.6.4 Jail Coverage Errors

Two related types of coverage errors, duplications and being enumerated in the wrong place, are somewhat more likely in jail, rather than prison, settings. In this context, jail rosters would be a particularly crude measure, given the numbers of short-term inmates that may temporarily appear on a given jail roster but reside elsewhere. This short-term, pretrial population is also somewhat likely to also have been included in residential enumerations. Estimates of these errors in the jail would be possible by examining the April 1 roster and determining who was listed on April 1, but not appearing on the roster at specified dates and times before and after the Census Day. Cross-checking names in the jail enumeration with those collected through residential enumerations would also reveal some component of this error. These “counting in the wrong place” errors would have little impact on state-wide and perhaps county-wide counts in that jail inmates are likely to normally live within the county of their confinement. This is not true of prison populations, who are most likely to be residents of that state, although highly unlikely to be the resident of the county in which they are imprisoned. It is unclear, however, if the information gleaned from such an extended effort would be of any great utility.

4.6.5 Complications in Racial and Ethnic Categories

A more significant problem in terms of racial and ethnic categorization exists in these administrative databases. This report described several potential errors or mis-representations as suggested by several sources: non-standard abbreviations (e.g. HIS, MEX, IA and IND), negotiated interpretation by enumerators and limitations imposed by third-party assessment or

recording of race and ethnic identity by official sources. Recall that one Crew Leader noted that administrative rosters preclude any self-declaration of this identifier.

Agency level data would, logically, contain these same problems but would eliminate those introduced in hard-copy facility printed rosters. Agency-based data would also be automated, programmable and would avoid coding errors found in hand-transcribed data.

5 Recommendations

In reviewing the data collected in this qualitative study, recommendations toward developing a Census Coverage Measurement study, improving the 2020 Census and developing research emerge.

5.1 An Agency Approach to Census Coverage Measurement

State and Federal prisons data are best approached from an agency, rather than individual, perspective. The 2010 Census was based on a facility/census block orientation. This resulted in an individual and negotiated enumeration process at the three facilities observed here and, presumably, all of the 1,185 state and Federal correctional facilities in the U.S. If administrative data is to be used in correctional GQs for the 2010 Census, examining the use of agency-wide data in these 51 systems should be considered. In addition to reducing the burden on the individual facilities, an agency-wide approach would produce consistent reports across these state and Federal correctional GQs. An agency approach would also reduce inefficiencies for census field staff. Working at an agency level to customize these administrative reports would provide the population lists for large numbers of individuals in a relatively short time.

Investing time in an agency approach presents additional benefits. Working closely with agency programmers, preparation for the next census could result in more consistent definitions of the race and ethnic categories both across the system and with the established census categories. Gaining knowledge of the structure and content of these databases could also result in the development of “census subroutines” in electronic form, eliminating the need to code data from hard copies into census machine-readable forms.

Such an approach would not be appropriate for the over 3,000 county jails, with one exception. The large, urban jails are likely to maintain databases similar to these prisons and could be included in a modified agency approach.

5.2 Improving the 2020 Census in Correctional Group Quarters: Dedicated Protocols and Correctional Specialists

Related to this agency approach is the development of a correctional protocol for these GQs. These protocols would structure enumerations at jails and prisons in a common and consistent way. For example, although the Enumerator Manual suggested a hierarchy of plans, these plans were not informed by any specific knowledge about correctional facilities. The emphasis on addresses, which did not fit the correctional worldview, and the subjective reconciliation by individual enumerating teams of racial categories, are examples of problems that could be addressed in developing a protocol for correctional facilities.

Correctional facilities operate best with a written, standardized protocol. Prior to the 2020 Census, a written protocol should be developed with specific information pertinent to

correctional settings. A review of the protocols used in the Correctional ACS may be instructive. While each state prison system and the Federal Bureau of Prisons would need a customized section (whether an agency approach is adopted or the individual facility approach is retained), the time invested in an agency-wide approach would produce benefits, such as reducing regional office time and providing consistent records within each system. Investing time at determining the best type of data for the upcoming censuses and developing a system-wide protocol will avoid the duplication of effort and the potential for subjective results present in the observed approach which relied on negotiations and enumerations at individual facilities in each of the nation's thousands of correctional facilities.

The Census Bureau should also consider developing correctional specialists who have a solid grasp of census issues in correctional facilities. Deploying these specialists throughout a given system, crossing regional boundaries may also introduce efficiencies. Whether the Census Bureau adopts an agency approach for prisons or continues to use the individual facility approach, collaborating with agency population data managers to determine the best approach will introduce efficiencies and standardize the process throughout the system.

Elements of a correctional protocol should include:

- detailed information about the census itself
- the type of reports in their system that fit the requirements
- ways to reconcile differences in databases and census forms (e.g. racial and ethnic categories)
- contact information or a dedicated "hotline" for further information

5.3 Research Recommendations

5.3.1 Survey of Correctional Approaches

The primary and secondary sites observed in this study all used administrative data. It is unknown, however, what enumeration approaches were used in other prisons and jails. A survey of the 50 state prison systems and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and sampling the over 3,000 jails would determine the type of data used in the 2010 effort. For example, the survey would detail whether data was obtained at an agency or local facility level and other questions that would assist the Census Bureau in planning for the Census 2020. If the pilot study suggested above or the proposed collaboration at database level is being considered, this survey could identify possible partners in this effort. This survey should be conducted by those with extensive experience with both operational and cultural aspects of corrections. An advisory committee of correctional professionals should monitor this study as well.

5.3.2 A Self-Enumeration Pilot

Given our knowledge about correctional populations and their potential for self-enumeration, a true self-enumeration pilot in one or more prisons could be conducted to determine the utility of inmate-completed forms. This pilot would, as much as possible, mirror the census process in the community and be measured through formal process and outcome evaluation methods. Process and outcome evaluation methodologies should be employed through a multi-level collaboration among correctional researchers, agency population management and

research staff, and Census Bureau researchers. The project should be monitored by an advisory board representing professional corrections organizations, such as the American Correctional Association, and American Jail Association, and Federal corrections experts such as the National Institute of Corrections and the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Census Bureau researchers, in collaboration with correctional agency researchers, would develop a research design that includes documentation of every stage of the process, determining the true response rate of the self-enumeration and assessing the cost-benefit of this approach in terms of census goals. Within the pilot prison sites, publicity and education campaigns would begin to prepare inmates for the coming census. Inmate community leaders, both formal and informal, could be recruited to build interest in the census; educational and treatment programs could incorporate census information and activities into their program; posters and public service announcements could inform the population and other census activities could be planned. Once the self-enumeration documents were collected, the number of individuals not completing the ICR forms could be quickly assessed by researchers. As in the community, enumerators would perform followup with eligible inmates. Telephone interviews and interviews in secure visiting units (behind glass) could be used when security concerns restricted face-to-face interactions. Some inmates may practically be excluded from enumerator interaction. These inmates could be enumerated from individual records. Supervising this process would require staff involvement, but choosing a pilot site based on security level would minimize these resources.

6 Conclusion: Beyond Counting

While this study suggests that an agency approach would show promise in both Census Coverage Measurement and future census process improvement, several questions remain. Beyond the actual enumeration and listing of names, do inadequacies in the demographic data warrant a form of CCM study? How does the fluidity of the correctional population affect a CCM study? Does the use of administrative records meet the goals of the census of “counting everyone in the right place and the right time”? Should administrative records collected at an agency level (for state and federal prisons) be the standard in the 2020 Census and beyond? These questions require some consideration within the parameters of the census goals. As has been asserted repeatedly, administrative rosters in correctional systems meet the first half of the census requirements by counting everyone present in these group quarters on the day the rosters are obtained. They are less successful in meeting the next goal of “everyone in the right place,” due to the possible duplications created by the short-term inmates, particularly in jails. Finally, these administrative records are least successful in answering valuable questions about race and ethnicity and home addresses. Addressing these questions will provide specific directions for the planning of Census 2020 in correctional group quarters.

7 References

- Agar, M. (1996). *Professional Stranger: An informal introduction to ethnography, second edition*. New York: Academic Press.
- Berg, B. (2008). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Jonas, K. (2003). *Group Quarters Enumeration Report* (August 2003). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. and Y. S. Lincoln (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fetterman, D. (1998). *Ethnography Step-by-step, second edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- GAO (2003). *Federal programs: Ethnographic studies can inform agencies' actions* GAO-03-455, March 2003. Available at <http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-455>.
- Gertz, C. (1983). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In R. Emerson (ed) *Contemporary Field Work: A Collection of Readings* Boston: Little & Brown, pp. 19-36.
- National Research Council (2007). *Research and Plans for Coverage Measurement in the 2010 Census: Interim Assessment*. Panel on Coverage Evaluation and Correlation Bias in the 2010 Census, Robert Bell and Michael L. Cohen (Eds.). Committee on National Statistics. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- National Research Council (2009). *Research and Plans for Coverage Measurement in the 2010 Census: Panel on Coverage Evaluation and Correlation Bias in the 2010 Census*, Robert Bell and Michael L. Cohen (Eds.). Committee on National Statistics. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- Sabol, W., West, H., & Cooper, M. (2009). *Prisoners in 2008*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Spradley, J. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stephan, (2008). *Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2005*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Strauss, A. & J. Corbin. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, 2nd ed. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

8 Appendix 1

The dynamics of correctional populations

Jail Facility Movement

As listed in the Jail's administrative rosters, 2,343 individuals were housed in the Jail on the morning of April 1, 2008. Data show that the Jail experienced 100 bookings or admissions and 149 releases between April 1 and 2. These admissions and releases account for a decrease in population by 49 individuals and describe the fluidity of this population over one 24 hour period. These admissions and releases occur throughout the day, twenty-four hours a day. A review of the admissions data by 15 minute increments demonstrates that admissions were recorded most frequently at the rate of two each 15 minute period but range in frequency from zero to as many as five per 15 minute period. Likewise, releases occurred throughout the day, yet in 15 minute periods ranged in frequency from zero to as many as 31. Admissions to the Jail can originate from local agencies within the county, state parole, or federal agencies (this jail houses federal inmates due to the proximity to the Federal District Court). Releases from this facility result from a broad range of reasons including completion of sentence, early release, transfer of custody, bail, citation, acquittal, or dismissal of charges. Given the typical six week period of re-enumeration survey, the discrete individuals in the Jail could vary widely with, based on this example, thousands of individuals coming and going through its doors every day over that period.

Women's Prison 1 movement

Women's Prison 1 housed a total of 3,740 individuals at the time the administrative roster was printed at approximately 0001 hours on Census Day 2010. Reports are available that describe the total number of inmates housed at the institution at one minute after midnight or 0001 hours, the "beginning count" for their day. Likewise the count at 2,359 is referred to as the "ending count" for the day. Table 1, Admissions & Releases at Women's' Prison 1, presents the differences between these beginning and ending counts.

As shown in Table 1, there is a change in population each day in all but two in this 30-day period. This net difference in population ranged from a net reduction in population of 15 individuals to a net addition of 41 individuals in a 24-hour period, and reflected a median change in population including a net reduction of four individuals in a day. Admissions to the institution can be accounted for by new admissions from county jail facilities, transfers from other department institutions, or re-admissions after being temporarily released due to medical treatment or court proceedings. Departures are attributable to individuals released to parole, transfers to another facility, temporary release to outside medical treatment, court proceedings, or death.

The difference of counts each day represents the net difference in population count in a 24 hour period at Prison 1, but does not illustrate the discrete numbers of individuals entering or leaving the prison. For example, if 20 women were released and 20 women admitted during a 24 hour time period, this would affect the roster listings, but not the overall count. Further analysis of the admissions and release data would determine the specific rather than the net change.

Table 1: Admissions & Releases at Women’s Prison 1

Date	Beginning Count	Ending Count	Net Difference
04/01/10	3740	3760	20
04/02/10	3760	3751	-9
04/03/10	3751	3751	0
04/04/10	3751	3736	-15
04/05/10	3736	3730	-6
04/06/10	3730	3742	12
04/07/10	3742	3755	13
04/08/10	3755	3769	14
04/09/10	3769	3766	-3
04/10/10	3766	3755	-11
04/11/10	3755	3747	-8
04/12/10	3747	3749	2
04/13/10	3751	3739	-12
04/14/10	3738	3729	-9
04/15/10	3729	3745	16
04/16/10	3745	3736	-9
04/17/10	3736	3728	-8
04/18/10	3728	3722	-6
04/19/10	3722	3714	-8
04/20/10	3714	3755	41
04/21/10	3755	3757	2
04/22/10	3757	3747	-10
04/23/10	3747	3752	5
04/24/10	3752	3743	-9
04/25/10	3743	3755	12
04/26/10	3735	3735	0
04/27/10	3735	3757	22
04/28/10	3762	3758	-4
04/29/10	3758	3760	2
04/30/10	3760	3752	-8

We examined the “in and out” movement for one day to provide a sense of the fluidity in this facility. On this day, 51 new arrivals were recorded at WP 1: 16 were new admissions, 4 were parole violators, 11 changed classification status (from Reception to General Population) and the remainder were returned to the facility from outside courts or hospitals. On the same day, 44 women left the facility: 7 were paroled, 14 transferred to another facility, 19 were on medical transfer and 2 were reclassified back to Reception. While this resulted in a net change in population numbers, only 20 out of the 51 women were newly arrived at the facility, beginning their residence in the prison, and 23 of the 44 departures left for new places to “eat and sleep.”

These shifts in both administrative listings and real residence change would occur every day of the year.

9 Appendix 2

Protocols for Post-Enumeration Interviews

1. Post-enumeration interview protocol with jail and prison staff
2. Post-enumeration interview protocol with Census Bureau contact

Post-enumeration interview with jail and prison staff

Using Ethnography to Investigate Coverage of the Group Quarters (GQ) Population

Post-enumeration interviews: Jail & Prison Staff

April 2010

Barbara Owen, PhD

INSTRUCTIONS FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

Texts to be read to participants are *in italics*.

Instructions for interviewers are written IN CAPS.

INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

GATHER ALL NECESSARY MATERIALS FOR THE IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW:

- HARD COPY OF THE LIST OF QUESTIONS/PROTOCOL (INTERVIEWER GUIDE)
- CONSENT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS TO BE READ TO RESPONDENT

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study. Let me start by telling you a little more about what we'll be doing today. As you know, we have been hanging around, observing the 2010 Census process and asking you a lot of questions about how the 2010 Census has been conducted. Today is our last visit with you and our goal is to collect your feedback on the 2010 Census Operation so we can understand how the enumeration was conducted in correctional facilities like yours. We are interested in your honest opinion about the Census and its operation, particularly your experiences assisting the 2010 Census operation and the completion of Census forms. We are also very interested in hearing about your recommendations about improving this enumeration process for the next Census in 2020.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

DESCRIBE CONFIDENTIALITY POLICY

Our session today is completely confidential. Any names you provide will never be used in our reports, and all of the information you provide will be completely confidential. Also, your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can decline to answer any particular question. Please feel free to ask me any questions at any time.

**IN-PERSON INTERVIEW: PARTICIPANT COMPLETE CONSENT FORM NOW
RECORD START AND END TIME**

Topic Outline for Unstructured Interviews

1. *The first question asks about any other experiences you have had with the Census.*

Have you had any other experiences with the Census prior to this 2010 enumeration?
What can you tell us about that?

2. *Now we want to ask you some questions about your specific experiences with the 2010 enumeration.*

When and how did you first become aware of the Census staff coming to your facility?

Who did you meet with?

What did you learn about the 2010 enumeration from them?

What other information did you get about the 2010 Census?

<FOR PRISON STAFF> How was this process coordinated through agency office? Main

Tell us about your planning process. What did it entail?

Who else in the facility did you include in your planning?

3. *This next set of questions asks about enumeration.*

Please describe the enumeration process for us.

Please describe your experience with obtaining the rosters.

Please describe your experience in interacting with the Census Bureau staff during the enumeration.

What went according to plan?

What did not?

What kind of impact did the Census 2010 process have on your facility?

Would it be possible to have inmates fill out forms directly?

Would it be possible for the Census Bureau staff to interview the inmates?

4. *These next questions ask you to reflect on this experience. We are almost done.*

How much time would you guess you spent on this process altogether?

Was it clear what the Census Bureau staff wanted? How so?

What was good or positive about this experience?

What was a problem or negative about this experience?

Now that it is over, what would you do differently next time?

What would you tell the next person who needs to do this?

5. *Last set of questions. We are very interested in learning what recommendations you might have for improving this process for the 2020 Census.*

What recommendations do you have for this facility?

For the Agency?

For the Census Bureau?

We are done with the questions we wanted to ask. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your experience with the 2010 Census? Thank you again for your help. It is very much appreciated.

Post-enumeration interview protocol with Census Bureau Census contact

**Using Ethnography to Investigate Coverage of the
Group Quarters (GQ) Population
Post-enumeration interviews: Crew Leader
April 2010
Barbara Owen, PhD**

INSTRUCTIONS FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

Texts to be read to participants are *in italics*.

Instructions for interviewers are written IN CAPS.

INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

GATHER ALL NECESSARY MATERIALS FOR THE IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW:

- **HARD COPY OF THE LIST OF QUESTIONS/PROTOCOL (INTERVIEWER GUIDE)**

INSTRUCTIONS TO BE READ TO RESPONDENT

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study. Let me start by telling you a little more about what we'll be doing today. We have been observing the 2010 Census process <in the jail> and would like to ask you some questions about your experience in collecting the information from your assigned Group Quarters. We're studying how the GQ enumeration takes place in correctional facilities from the point of view of the Census Crew Leader.

We are contract researchers and we are independent of the 2010 census operation. We want to learn about your experience in order to start planning for the 2020 Census enumeration. Do you have any questions before we begin?

DESCRIBE CONFIDENTIALITY

Our session today is completely confidential. Any names you provide will never be used in our reports, and all of the information you provide will be completely confidential. We only want to know about your experience so the Census Bureau can learn from it in planning the 2020 Census. Also, your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can decline to answer any particular question. Please feel free to ask me any questions at any time.

RECORD START AND END TIME

Topic Outline for Unstructured Interviews

- 1. Please tell us how you first contacted the jail?**
- 2. How did that first contact go?**
- 3. Please describe how you and the <Jail contact> worked out the enumeration process.**
- 4. What was your final plan for the enumeration?**
- 5. How did you collect the rosters?**
- 6. What did you then do with the rosters?**
- 7. Please describe how the rosters were processed.**

**How did things go?
Were there any problems?**

- 8. Anything else?**

Thank you very much for your time. You have been very nice and we appreciate it.

10 Appendix 3

Analysis Codes

Coding for Field Notes May-June 2010

“3 out of 5” questions

A

Access & trust

ACS

Actual enumeration

Agency head

Approaches to conducting enumeration—planned

Arranging our visits : Our work; Roster – CB original & alternative; Coordinating with Census workers

Attitudes: BAO team- VSP defending; Hickman informing us

Attitudes: CB workers: toward facility, toward BAO team

Attitudes: Inmate

Attitudes: Staff: toward Census, FRS; BAO team

B

BAO team contact with facilities

BAO team- relationship with facility; past; current

C

CB Attitudes: CB workers: toward facility, toward BAO team

CB Facility contact

CB ID of workers

CB info packet

CB inmate contact

CB instructions

CB instructions

CB knowledge: could not answer questions

CB knowledge: not knowing abt prisons

CB supervisor

CB Training: title 13

CB workers

CB workers – jail contact

CB workers at facility

CB: demands on facility time/staff resources

Census block

Census committee

Census day

Census day

Coming down to wire

Census fatigue
Census frustration /burnout
Changes
Clearance issues
Communication
Communication- unclear
Confirming report runs
Conflicts
Confusion
Consistency/inconsistency
Contact emails
Contact with CB
Contact; Phone calls
Cooperation/willingness
Coordination- lack of
Culture agency
Culture CB
Culture differences
Culture facility

D

Data bases future
Data bases now
Data Reports: Alternatives & digital
Decision-making authority
Definitions: conflict
Differences jail/prisons
Differences: between jails & prisons
Differences: with other group quarters GQ

E

Efficiencies/Inefficiencies
Enumeration Planned
Enumeration: alternative
Enumeration: problems; gold bricking
Enumerations: actual; on site & off site
Experiences with CB in community
Experiences: with CB in past

F

Facility burden: time, staffing, aggravation
Facility size
Facility coordination
Facility decision-making
Facility exp with ACS
Facility exp with Census 2010

Facility experience with past census
Facility- who involved? Right person involved?
Fluidity /movement
Follow up
Follow up with inmates

G

Grapevine: HQ
Grapevine: talking to other facilities

H

Main office
Hierarchy
High level coordination
HQ coordination
HQ attitude
HQ contacts
HQ director
HQ follow CB lead- no suggestions
HQ Main office
HQ monitoring
HQ process
HQ role
HQ tracking

I

Impact on facility
Inmate attitude toward CB, participation
Inmates Contact with
Inmates nature of population
Inmates sworn
Inmates: enumeration plan

J

Jail

K

Keeping us in the loop
Knowledge of correctional culture
Knowledge of systems
Knowledge of: operational practice
Knowledge of: prison

L

Left hanging/unknown next steps
Legal issues

Legal questions
Local conditions/context

M
Monitoring process: Role of HQ

O
Observation
Organizational structure
Our observations: planned/ actual
Out of office Days off (24 hours/7 day a week)
Out of office Furlough

P
Passing the buck- census
Passing the buck HQ
Passing the Buck internally
PIO
Plan: change
Posters
Prep
Prep work by facility
Prep work with CB
Prep work with HQ
Preparation-
Preparation – Facility
Prior history with CB
Process

Q
Questions
Questions abt CB process: to CB FR
Questions abt CB: to us

R
Racial & ethnic categories: mismatch; self identifying & system ID
Recommendations: BAO team
Recommendations: facility
Reports
Reports- different names; asking for new report while on ground
Rosters- interpreting – length of name
Rosters: by Bed #

S
Staff attitudes toward census : duty; can do; just tell us what to do
Staff attitudes towards BAO team

Staff Attitudes: Staff: toward Census, FRS; BAO team
Staff interest
Staff role in following up
Staff time
Staff volunteers

T

Terminology: D 20s, ICR

Theme: “meeting each party’s needs” (CB FR after enumeration)

U

Understanding how census 2010 works

Understanding how prison work

Understanding time schedule of facility

W

Warden

Wasting time & resources CB not understanding resource issue in faculties

Wish/do over