

Appendix B. Source and Accuracy of the Data

SAMPLE DESIGN	B-1	Illustration of the computation of the standard error of a difference.....	B-11
Introduction.....	B-1	Medians	B-11
Designation of AHS-MS sample housing units for the 1990 survey	B-2	Illustration of the computation of the 90-percent confidence interval of a median	B-11
1990 AHS-MS original sample selection for the 1970-based areas sample of the metropolitan areas.....	B-2	Standard error tables.....	B-13
Sample from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe.....	B-3		
Sample from the 1970-based new construction universe.....	B-3		
Sample from the 1970-based nonpermit universe	B-3		
Sample selection for the AHS-MS Coverage Improvement Program	B-4		
1986 AHS-MS sample reduction and sample reinstatement.....	B-4		
1990 sample reinstatement	B-4		
AHS-MS sample selection for the 1980-based area sample of the metropolitan areas	B-4		
Sample from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe	B-4		
Sample from the 1980-based new construction universe	B-5		
Sample from the 1980-based nonpermit universe	B-5		
ESTIMATION	B-5		
1990 housing inventory.....	B-6		
Type M noninterview adjustment.....	B-6		
Type A noninterview adjustment	B-6		
Ratio estimation procedure for the 1970-based permit-issuing universe	B-6		
Ratio estimation procedure for the 1980-based permit-issuing universe	B-7		
Mobile home ratio estimation	B-7		
Independent total housing unit ratio estimation.....	B-7		
ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES.....	B-8		
Nonsampling errors.....	B-8		
AHS-MS content errors	B-8		
Coverage errors	B-9		
Rounding errors	B-9		
Sampling errors for the AHS metropolitan area sample	B-9		
Illustration of the use of the standard error tables	B-10		
Differences.....	B-11		

SAMPLE DESIGN

Introduction. The estimates for each of the 11 metropolitan areas in this report series (H170/90) are based on data collected from the 1990 American Housing Survey Metropolitan Sample (AHS-MS), which was conducted by the Bureau of the Census acting as collection agent for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The sample areas covered for metropolitan areas that remained in the AHS sample after survey year 1983 are consistent with the 1983 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA), consolidated metropolitan statistical area (CMSA), or primary metropolitan statistical area (PMSA). In some instances, a given metropolitan area is a combination of primary metropolitan statistical areas and will be referred to as PMSA's. In addition to adding new areas to some metropolitan samples in order to comply with the 1983 definitional changes, some new metropolitan areas have been added. Thus, each of the 1990 metropolitan areas will fall into one of two categories:

- a. Areas of the same geographic area as defined for surveys prior to 1984 (i.e., areas in which the 1970 OMB definition of a standard metropolitan statistical area is the same as the 1983 MSA, PMSA, or CMSA definition, 1970-based area)—Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA PMSA; Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN PMSA; and Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA PMSA.
- b. Areas consisting of new area in addition to the 1970-based area—Denver, CO CMSA; Kansas City, MO-KS CMSA; Miami-Ft. Lauderdale, FL CMSA; New Orleans, LA MSA; Pittsburgh, PA CMSA; Portland, OR-WA CMSA; Rochester, NY MSA; and San Antonio, TX MSA.

The metropolitan areas selected for the 1990 AHS-MS are interviewed on a rotating basis once every 4 years. Initially, each metropolitan area had an expected sample

size of 4,250 housing units, uniformly distributed throughout nine panels (panels 4 through 12). For all of the 1990 MSA's, the interviewing was conducted from June 1990 through December 1990. Previously reduced cases from panels 4 and 5 were reinstated.

In this metropolitan area, 4,759 AHS-MS housing units were eligible for interview. Of these sample housing units, 416 interviews were not obtained, because for occupied sample units, the occupants refused to be interviewed, were not at home after repeated visits, or were unavailable for some other reason; or, for vacant units, no informed respondent could be found after repeated visits. In addition to the AHS-MS housing units eligible for interview, 158 units were visited but were not eligible for interview because they were condemned, unfit, demolished, converted to group quarters use, etc.

Designation of AHS-MS sample housing units for the 1990 survey. The sample housing units designated to be interviewed in the 1990 survey consisted of the following categories, which are described in the following sections:

Housing units which were in the 1970-based area include the following:

- a. All sample housing units that were interviewed in the previous survey. This sample includes housing units that were selected as part of the 1976-1981 Coverage Improvement Program. These Coverage Improvement cases represented most of the housing units that, until these procedures were implemented, did not have a chance of selection.
- b. All sample housing units that were type A noninterviews (i.e., units eligible to be interviewed) or type B noninterviews (i.e., units not eligible for interview at the time of the survey but which could become eligible in the future) in the previous survey. (For a list of reasons for type A noninterviews, see the facsimile of the 1990 AHS questionnaire, page A-25).
- c. All sample housing units selected from a listing of new residential construction building permits issued since the previous survey. This sample represented the housing units built in permit-issuing areas since the previous survey.
- d. All sample housing units that were added since the previous survey in sample segments from the nonpermit universe. This sample represented additions to the housing inventory since the previous survey in nonpermit-issuing areas.
- e. In the 1970-based areas of the Denver, CO CMSA; Kansas City, MO-KS CMSA; New Orleans, LA MSA; Portland, OR-WA CMSA; Rochester, NY MSA; and San Antonio, TX MSA, all sample housing units selected from the 1980 Census of Population and Housing.
- f. All sample housing units in panels 4 and 5 that were reinstated in sample in 1990. This includes units that had been dropped from sample as part of the 1986 reduction.

Housing units within new areas added to the metropolitan area in 1980 and for metropolitan areas that were in sample for the first time in 1986 (1980-based area):

- a. All housing units selected from the 1980 Census of Population and Housing.
- b. All housing units that were selected from a list of new residential construction building permits. This sample represented the housing units built in permit-issuing areas since the 1980 census.
- c. All sample housing units that were added to sample segments in the nonpermit universe. This sample represents additions to the housing inventory in nonpermit-issuing areas since the 1980 census.
- d. Sample housing units from panels 4 and 5 that were reinstated in sample in 1990.

The following table shows the percent of the AHS-MS old construction sample that is 1970-based and 1980-based for each metropolitan area:

Metropolitan area	Percent 1970-based area	Percent 1980-based area
Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA PMSA	100.0	0.0
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN PMSA	100.0	0.0
Denver, CO CMSA	97.6	2.4
Kansas City, MO-KS CMSA	91.0	9.0
Miami-Ft. Lauderdale, FL CMSA	63.3	36.7
New Orleans, LA MSA	95.2	4.8
Pittsburgh, PA CMSA	94.3	5.7
Portland, OR-WA CMSA	94.8	5.2
Rochester, NY MSA	91.1	8.9
San Antonio, TX MSA	95.4	4.6
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA PMSA ...	100.0	0.0

1990 AHS-MS original sample selection for the 1970-based area sample of the metropolitan areas. The 1990 AHS-MS original sample for the 1970-based area of the metropolitan areas was selected from two frames:

- a. Housing units enumerated in the 1970 Census of Population and Housing in areas under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (the 1970-based permit-issuing universe).
- b. Housing units constructed in permit-issuing areas since the 1970 census (the 1970-based new construction universe).

In addition, the sample for those metropolitan areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing in 1970 included a sample selected from a third frame: housing units located in areas not under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (the 1970-based nonpermit universe).

In 1970, the Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA PMSA; Miami-Ft. Lauderdale, FL CMSA; and Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA PMSA, were the only metropolitan areas that were 100-percent permit-issuing.

Sampling operations, described in the following paragraphs, were performed separately within the central city and balance, using the 1970 OMB definitions of the central city of each metropolitan area for each of the sample frames. The overall sampling rate used to select the sample for each metropolitan area was determined by the size of the sample. Each metropolitan area had a sampling rate about the same for the central city and the balance, since the sample was distributed proportionately between the two, according to the corresponding distribution of total housing units.

Sample from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe. The major portion of the sample in each of the metropolitan areas was selected from a file that represented the 20-percent sample of housing units enumerated in permit-issuing areas of the metropolitan areas during the 1970 Census of Population and Housing. This file contained records for occupied housing units, vacant housing units, and housing units in certain special places or group quarters. Sampling operations were done separately for the special place and group quarters records and for the occupied and vacant housing unit records. Before the sample was selected from the occupied and vacant housing unit records, the occupied records were stratified by race of the head of household (nonBlack/Black), and the vacant records were stratified into four categories pertaining to the value or rent associated with the vacant housing units. The occupied housing unit records were further stratified so that each unit was assigned to one of 50 strata according to its tenure (owner/renter), family size, and family income category as illustrated by the following table:

Family income	Tenure									
	Owner family size					Renter family size				
	1	2	3	4	5+	1	2	3	4	5+
Under \$3,000										
\$3,000 to \$5,999										
\$6,000 to \$9,999										
\$10,000 to \$14,999										
\$15,000 and over										

Thus, the occupied housing unit records from the permit-issuing universe were assigned to one of 100 strata for either the central city or for the balance, and the vacant housing unit records were assigned to one of the four vacant strata for either the central city or for the balance of the metropolitan areas. A sample selection procedure was then instituted that would produce one-half of the desired sample. However, whenever a record was selected to be in sample, the housing unit record adjacent to it on the file

was also selected to be in sample, thereby insuring the necessary designated sample size.

Before the sample was selected from the group quarters and special place records, the records were stratified by census tract and census enumeration district (ED) within the central city and within the balance of the metropolitan areas. A sample of special place records was then selected by a procedure that produced one-quarter of the desired sample size. However, at the time of the survey, the housing units at each of the special places were listed and subsampled at a rate that produced an expected four sample units, thereby insuring the necessary designated sample size.

Sample from the 1970-based new construction universe. The second frame from which the metropolitan area sample was selected was a list of new construction building permits issued since 1970 (i.e., the new construction universe). The sample selection from the list of new construction building permits was an independent operation within the metropolitan area. Under clerically selected procedures, the list of permits was stratified by the date the permits were issued, and clusters of an expected four (usually adjacent) housing units were formed. These clusters were then sampled for inclusion at the overall sampling rate. In February 1984, the new construction sampling operation for the 1970-based and 1980-based areas were combined into one computerized system.

The universe sampled in the computerized system will be referred to in the estimation section as the 1980-based permit universe. Under these procedures, prior to sample selection, the list of permits was stratified by the date of issue, State, 1980 central city and balance, county or minor civil division, and permit office. Clusters of an expected four (usually adjacent) housing units were formed. These clusters were then sampled for inclusion at twice the overall sampling rate. The housing units within each of the clusters were then subsampled so that two of the four housing units originally selected were kept in sample.

Sample from the 1970-based nonpermit universe. For those metropolitan areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing, the remainder of the AHS-MS sample was selected from a frame consisting of areas not under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (i.e., the nonpermit universe). The first step in the sampling operation for the nonpermit universe was the selection of a sample of census enumeration districts. Prior to this sample selection, the ED's were stratified by census tract within the central city and within the balance of the metropolitan area. The probability of selection of an ED was proportionate to the following:

$$\frac{\text{Number of housing units in 1970 census ED} + \frac{\text{Group quarters population in 1970 census ED}}{3}}{4}$$

The sample ED's were then divided into segments (i.e., small land areas with well-defined boundaries having an expected size of four, or a multiple of four, housing units). At the time of the survey, those segments that did not have an expected size of four were further subdivided to produce an expected four sample housing units. The next step was the selection of one of these segments within each sample ED. All housing units in existence at the time of interview in these selected segments were eligible for sample. Thus, housing units enumerated in the 1970 census as well as housing units built since the 1970 census were included.

Sample selection for the AHS-MS Coverage Improvement Program. The AHS-MS Coverage Improvement Program was undertaken to correct certain deficiencies in the AHS-Metropolitan area sample from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe and the 1970-based new construction universe within the 1970-based area. The coverage deficiencies included the following units:

- a. New construction from building permits issued before January 1970, but completed after April 1, 1970.
- b. Mobile homes placed in parks either missed during the 1970 census or established since the 1970 census.
- c. Housing units missed in the 1970 census.
- d. Housing units converted to residential use that were nonresidential at the time of the 1970 census.
- e. Houses that have been moved onto their present site since the 1970 census.
- f. Mobile homes placed outside parks since the 1970 census or vacant at the time of the 1970 census.

For a detailed description of the coverage improvement sample selection process, see earlier reports in the H170 series for the years 1976 through 1981.

1986 AHS-MS sample reduction and sample reinstatement. The 1986 AHS-MS sample reduction dropped units from sample, whereas the 1986 AHS-MS sample reinstatement added enumerated units that were previously dropped from sample. The universes were (a) the 1970-based permit-issuing universe, (b) the 1970-based new construction universe, and (c) the 1970-based nonpermit universe.

Sample reduction and reinstatement involved dropping or adding (a) individual housing units from the permit-issuing universe, (b) whole clusters from the new construction universe, and (c) whole segments from the nonpermit universe.

The reduction/reinstatement was implemented to achieve two criteria:

- a. A sample size of 4,250 in all metropolitan areas.
- b. A sample having an equal number of owners and renters.

To achieve these results, each unit was classified according to the original panel number (the original sample was divided into 12 panels, with one-twelfth of the sample being in each panel) and 1986 tenure (each housing unit was given a 1986 tenure based on the previous year's tenure status). To simplify field procedures, panels 1 through 3 (i.e., a random one-fourth of the original sample) were dropped from sample whenever possible. More sample reductions were implemented separately for each 1986 tenure group (using different selection rates) across the remaining panels.

1990 sample reinstatement. In 1990, panels 4 and 5 were reinstated in the sample. These panels had been dropped from the 1986 sample, and their units were not interviewed in 1986. Before the reinstatement, most units in panels 4 and 5 were last interviewed in 1981-1983. The reinstatement also included units dropped as part of the 1986 tenure reduction that were last interviewed in 1979-1981.

AHS-MS sample selection for the 1980-based area sample of the metropolitan areas. The sample for new areas added to the 1970-based metropolitan areas, and metropolitan areas in sample for the first time that, in 1980, were 100-percent permit-issuing, was selected from two frames:

- a. Housing units enumerated in the 1980 Census of Population and Housing in areas under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (the 1980-based permit-issuing universe).
- b. Housing units constructed in permit-issuing areas since the 1980 census (1980-based new construction universe).

In addition, the sample for those metropolitan areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing in 1980 included a sample from a third frame: housing units not under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (1980-based nonpermit universe).

In 1980, the Kansas City, MO-KS CMSA; New Orleans, LA MSA; Pittsburgh, PA CMSA; Rochester, NY MSA; and San Antonio, TX MSA, were the only metropolitan areas that added new areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing.

To satisfy confidentiality requirements in the Denver, CO CMSA; Kansas City, MO-KS CMSA; New Orleans, LA MSA; Portland, OR-WA CMSA; Rochester, NY MSA; and the San Antonio, TX MSA, it was necessary to supplement the existing sample within the 1970-based area. The additional housing units were selected separately for each metropolitan area from the 1980-based permit issuing universe.

Sample from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe. The major portion of the sample in each metropolitan area was selected from a file that represented all the housing units

enumerated in permit-issuing areas during the 1980 Census of Population and Housing. This file contained records for occupied housing units, vacant housing units, and housing units in group quarters. Sampling operations were done separately for noninstitutionalized group quarters and for all other housing units in permit-issuing areas. In addition, in order that an equal number of owner and renter housing units were selected in each metropolitan area, a selection rate that differed by tenure group was used. Before the sample was selected, the housing units that were not classified as group quarters were stratified into 60 categories by tenure, contract rent, value, and number of rooms as illustrated by the following table:

Contract rent and value	Number of rooms		
	1-3	4-5	6+
RENTER			
Contact Rent:			
Less than \$100			
\$100 to \$149			
\$150 to \$199			
\$200 to \$249			
\$250 to \$299			
\$300 to \$349			
\$350 to \$399			
\$400 or more			
Not available			
OWNER			
Value:			
Less than \$20,000			
\$20,000 to \$29,999			
\$30,000 to \$34,999			
\$35,000 to \$39,999			
\$40,000 to \$49,999			
\$50,000 to \$64,999			
\$65,000 to \$79,999			
\$80,000 to \$99,999			
\$100,000 to \$149,999			
\$150,000 or more			
Not available			

The group quarters housing units were grouped into two strata: (1) institutionalized group quarters; and (2) noninstitutionalized group quarters.

The following sample selection procedures were then implemented separately within the central city and balance of the metropolitan area. For the Denver, CO CMSA; Kansas City, MO-KS CMSA; New Orleans, LA MSA; Portland, OR-WA CMSA; Rochester, NY MSA; and the San Antonio, TX MSA, the sample selections were implemented separately by the 1970-based and 1980-based areas. All units were sorted by the 1980 central city and balance, stratum, State, district office, ED, and census serial number. The sample selection procedure was then implemented separately for (a) institutionalized group quarters and nongroup quarters housing units, and (b) noninstitutionalized group quarters.

Individual housing units were selected for the nongroup quarters but each institutionalized group quarters had one chance of selection. Before the sample selection for the

noninstitutionalized group quarters was implemented, the following measure of size was calculated for each record:

$$\frac{(1/4) \times (\text{Total group quarters population})}{2.75}$$

The noninstitutionalized group quarters were then selected proportionate to the measure of size.

Sample from the 1980-based new construction universe.

The second frame from which the metropolitan area sample was selected was a list of new construction building permits issued since 1980 (i.e., the new construction universe). The sample selection from the list of new construction building permits was an independent operation within each metropolitan area. This operation was described in the discussion of the 1970-based new construction universe.

Sample from the 1980-based nonpermit universe. For those metropolitan areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing, the remainder of the AHS-MS sample was selected from a frame consisting of areas not under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (i.e., the 1980-based nonpermit universe). The first step in the sampling operation for the nonpermit universe was the selection of a sample of census ED's within these areas (using the overall sampling rate). Prior to this sample selection, the ED's were sorted by State, district office, and enumeration district number. The probability of selection of an ED was proportionate to the following:

Number of housing units 1980 census ED	+	Noninstitutionalized group quarters population in 1980 census ED
		2.75
		4

The sample ED's were then divided into segments (i.e., small land areas with well-defined boundaries having an expected size of four, or a multiple of four, housing units). At the time of the survey, those segments that did not have an expected size of four housing units were further subdivided to produce an expected four sample housing units. Following the division, a segment from each sample ED was selected. All housing units in existence at the time of interview in these selected segments were eligible for sample. Thus, housing units enumerated in the 1980 census as well as housing units built since the 1980 census are included.

ESTIMATION

The 1990 AHS-Metropolitan sample produced estimates pertaining to characteristics of the housing inventory at the time of the interview (i.e., the 1990 housing inventory).

1990 housing inventory. The AHS estimates of characteristics of the 1990 housing inventory were produced using a multistage ratio estimation procedure. Before the implementation of the ratio estimation procedure, the basic weight (i.e., the inverse of the probability of selection) for each interviewed sample housing unit was adjusted to account for Type M and Type A noninterviews.

Type M noninterview adjustment. The Type M noninterviews are sample units that were dropped because of selection by another survey or because of permit unavailability. These noninterviews occur in (a) the 1980-based permit-issuing area universe, (b) the 1980-based nonpermit-issuing area universe, and (c) the 1980-based new construction universe.

The adjustment was done separately for the above universes for the central city and balance for each metropolitan area. The adjustment was equal to the following:

$$\frac{\text{AHS-MS sample estimate of 1980 housing units in the cell} + \text{Weighted count of Type M noninterviewed housing units}}{\text{AHS-MS sample estimate of 1980 housing units in the cell}}$$

Type A noninterview adjustment. Type A noninterviews are sample units for which (a) occupants were not home, (b) occupants refused to be interviewed, or (c) occupants were unavailable for some other reason.

The adjustment was done on occupied units and was computed separately for (a) units in the 1980-based permit-issuing area universe, (b) new construction, and (c) all other housing units (this includes the 1970-based permit-issuing universe, the 1970-based and 1980-based nonpermit-issuing universes and the 1970-based new construction housing units built prior to the last survey).

For units in the 1980-based permit-issuing universe, a Type A noninterview adjustment factor was computed separately, for each of the 62 strata used in the sample selection process, by 1980 central city and balance. For new construction units, a Type A noninterview adjustment factor was computed separately, by central city and balance. For all other units, a Type A noninterview adjustment factor was calculated separately by tenure and 1970 central city and balance for each of the following:

- a. Twenty-four noninterview cells for sample housing units from the permit-issuing universe (each cell was derived from one or more of the 50 different strata used in the 1970-based permit-issuing universe, illustrated earlier).
- b. One noninterview cell for new construction housing units.
- c. One noninterview cell for mobile homes or trailers from the nonpermit-issuing universe.
- d. One noninterview cell for units that were not mobile homes or trailers from the nonpermit-issuing universe.

- e. Three noninterview cells for units from the coverage improvement universe.
- f. One noninterview cell for units classified as vacants at the time of the 1970 census.
- g. One noninterview cell for units classified as group quarters at the time of the 1970 census.

Within a given cell, the Type A noninterview adjustment factor was equal to the following ratio, using the basic weight times the Type M noninterview adjustment factor for the sample weight:

$$\frac{\text{Weighted count of interviewed housing units} + \text{Weighted count of Type A noninterviewed housing units}}{\text{Weighted count of interviewed housing units}}$$

Ratio estimation procedure for the 1970-based permit-issuing universe. The following ratio estimation procedure was employed for all sample housing units from the permit-issuing universe. This factor was computed separately for all sample housing units within each 1970-based permit-issuing universe noninterview cell mentioned previously. The ratio estimation factor for each cell was equal to the following:

$$\frac{\text{1970 census count of housing units from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell}}{\text{AHS-MS sample estimate of 1970-based housing units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell}}$$

For each metropolitan area, the numerators of the ratios were obtained from the 1970 Census of Population and Housing 20 percent file (long forms) of housing units enumerated in areas under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices.

The denominators of the ratio estimation factors were then obtained from weighted estimates of all the AHS-MS sample housing units from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe, using the existing weight (i.e., the basic weight times the Type A noninterview adjustment). The computed ratio estimation factor was then applied to the existing weight for each sample housing unit within the corresponding ratio estimation cells. This ratio estimation procedure was introduced to correct the probabilities of selection for samples, in each of the strata used in the sample selection of the 1970-based permit-issuing universe. Prior to the AHS-MS sample selection within each metropolitan area housing units already selected for other Census Bureau surveys were deleted from the permit-issuing universe. The same probability of selection was then applied to the remaining units to select the AHS-MS sample. Since the number of housing units deleted from the AHS-MS universe frame was not necessarily proportional among all

strata, some variation in the actual probability of selection between strata was introduced during the sample selection process.

Ratio estimation procedure for the 1980-based permit-issuing universe. The following ratio estimation procedure was employed for all sample units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe. This factor was computed separately for all metropolitan areas excluding the Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA PMSA; Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN PMSA; and Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA, PMSA within each 1980-based permit-issuing universe noninterview cell mentioned previously.

The ratio estimation factor was equal to the following:

$$\frac{\text{1980 census count of housing units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell}}{\text{AHS sample estimate of 1980-based housing units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell}}$$

AHS sample estimate of 1980-based housing units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell

For each metropolitan area, the numerator of the ratio was obtained from the 1980 Census of Population and Housing 100-percent file of housing units enumerated in areas under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices. The denominator of the ratio was obtained from weighted estimates of all the AHS-MS sample housing units within the corresponding ratio estimation categories using the existing weight (i.e., the basic weight times the Type M noninterview adjustment factor times the Type A noninterview adjustment factor).

The computed ratio estimation factor was then applied to the existing weight for each sample housing unit within the corresponding ratio estimation categories.

This ratio estimation procedure was introduced to adjust the sample estimate in each of the strata used in the sample selection of the 1980-based permit issuing universe to an independent estimate (1980 census count) for the strata. This adjustment was necessary since some sample units were dropped during processing.

Mobile home ratio estimation. The following ratio estimation procedure was applied in all areas:

$$\frac{\text{Independent estimate of occupied mobile homes for the corresponding geographic subdivision of the metropolitan area}}{\text{Sample estimate of mobile homes for the corresponding geographic subdivision of the metropolitan area}}$$

Sample estimate of mobile homes for the corresponding geographic subdivision of the metropolitan area

The numerator of this ratio was determined using data from the 1980 census and the 1990 census. The denominator was obtained using the existing weight of AHS

sample mobile home units (i.e., the starting weight times the Type M factor times the Type A factor). The computed ratio estimate factor was then applied to all interviewed mobile homes in all areas

Independent total housing unit ratio estimation. The following ratio estimation procedure was applied in all areas:

$$\frac{\text{Independent estimate of the occupied housing inventory for the corresponding geographic subdivision of the metropolitan area}}{\text{Sample estimate of the occupied housing inventory for the corresponding geographic subdivision of the metropolitan area}}$$

Sample estimate of the occupied housing inventory for the corresponding geographic subdivision of the metropolitan area

The independent estimates of occupied housing units that were used as the numerator of this ratio are described below. The denominator was obtained by using the existing weight of AHS sample units (excluding mobile homes, if mobile home ratio estimation was applied).

The methodology used to derive the independent estimates of occupied housing units used a three-step procedure. In step one, the change in the number of occupied housing units was computed for metropolitan areas by county, based on counts from the 1980 and 1990 Decennial Censuses of Population and Housing.

In step two, the monthly rate of change was derived by dividing the result of step one by the base of 120 months (10 years multiplied by 12 months per year).

In step three, the independent county estimate of households (E) for each county in a metropolitan area was produced using the following formula:

$$E = G + P(M)$$

where P = the proportion derived in step two above
M = the number of months from April 1, 1990, to the midpoint of the survey interview period
G = county counts of households for April 1, 1990, from the 1990 Decennial Census of Population and Housing

The above formula uses a midpoint factor that varies for metropolitan areas from 5 months to 6.5 months. The metropolitan areas with a 5-month midpoint factor were Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN; Kansas City, MO-KS; New Orleans, LA; Pittsburgh, PA; and San Antonio, TX. The Miami-Ft. Lauderdale, FL, metropolitan area used a 5.5-month midpoint. Those areas using a 6-month midpoint factor included Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA; Portland, OR-WA; Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA; and Rochester, NY. The Denver, CO, metropolitan area used a 6.5-month midpoint.

The weighting was designed to be consistent with the 1990 census, relying on linear interpolation between 1980 and 1990.

The survey estimate of occupied mobile homes after application of the mobile home ratio estimation factor described above was then subtracted from this independent estimate of occupied housing units. The resulting estimate of occupied housing units, excluding mobile homes, was used as the numerator for this ratio estimation.

The AHS-Metropolitan sample estimate of the housing inventory for the corresponding geographic area was obtained using existing weight (i.e., after the mobile home ratio estimation procedure for all areas).

The computed ratio estimation factors were then applied to all housing units in the corresponding geographic area of each metropolitan area and the resulting product was used as the final weight for tabulation purposes.

The effect of this ratio estimation procedure, as well as the overall estimation procedures, was to reduce the sampling error for most statistics below what would have been obtained by simply weighting the results of the sample by the inverse of the probability of selection. Since the housing population of the sample differed somewhat, by chance, from the metropolitan area as a whole, it can be expected that the sample estimates will be improved when the sample housing population, or different portions of it, is brought into agreement with known good estimates of the metropolitan area housing population.

ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES

There are two types of possible errors associated with estimates based on data from sample surveys—nonsampling and sampling errors. The following is a description of the nonsampling and sampling errors associated with the AHS sample estimates.

Nonsampling errors. In general, nonsampling errors can be attributed to many sources: inability to obtain information about all cases; definitional difficulties; differences in the interpretation of questions; inability or unwillingness of respondents to provide correct information; mistakes in recording or coding the data; other errors of collection, response, processing, and coverage; and estimation for missing data. Nonsampling errors are not unique to sample surveys since they can, and do, occur in complete censuses as well.

Obtaining a measurement of the total nonsampling error associated with the estimates from a survey is very difficult, considering the number of possible sources of error. However, an attempt was made to measure some of the nonsampling errors associated with the estimates for the 1990 AHS-Metropolitan sample. In the following sections, the major sources of nonsampling errors will be discussed.

AHS-MS content errors. A content reinterview program was done for the 1990 AHS-Metropolitan sample units. A sample of these units was revisited, and answers to some of the questions on the questionnaire were obtained again. The original interview and reinterview were assumed to be two independent readings and, thus, were the basis for the measurement of the accuracy of the data collected from interviewed units.

The 1990 Content Reinterview Program served as an interviewer quality check and a quality analysis of particular survey questions. All of the interviewers were selected for the quality check, which reviewed the interviewers' proficiency in properly evaluating the items listed below. The other portion of the reinterview program was performed to ensure that certain survey questions elicited consistent responses from the interviewed households. These reinterview items and their response variability are discussed below.

The six interviewer items reviewed were (1) correct unit visited; (2) interview status; (3) area segment coverage; (4) determination of extra units; (5) living quarters classification; and (6) household composition.

The AHS-MS survey items reviewed generally fell into two categories: mortgage and mobility. The results of this reinterview program, however, are not available at this time.

Although the results of the 1990 Content Reinterview Program are not available, past reinterview programs have shown that certain items are likely to produce moderate or high response variability. Response variability is defined as a measure of consistency between the original survey response to an item and the reinterview response to that item. Moderate levels of variability indicate that the response error is not insignificant in comparison with the sampling error. High variability indicates that the response errors are very significant in relation to the sampling errors with which they are associated; therefore, caution should be used when considering estimates of these characteristics. The 1985 Content Reinterview Program had five items that exhibited high variability: (1) major repairs over \$500 each; (2) payments the same throughout mortgage; (3) area lived at age 16; (4) preferred place to live in 5 years; and (5) size of lot. Prior-year results for the 1990 metropolitan areas can be found in the Census Bureau publication series H170 for the years 1981 through 1983.

Reinterview studies were also conducted in conjunction with previous AHS-National and AHS-MS enumerations. These studies included items dealing primarily with poor housing quality, attitudes about the neighborhood, and certain housing costs. The following table shows the items that had higher levels of inconsistency. Although not all of these questions were included in the 1990 reinterview studies, questions from previous enumerations were not altered enough to lead one to believe that the level of inconsistent responses would change.

Survey items	Level of inconsistency
Mice and rats	Moderate
Real estate taxes	Moderate
Cost of real estate taxes	Moderate
Prefer to live in same area or somewhere else ..	Moderate
Open cracks or holes on inside of building	Moderate to High
Holes in floors	Moderate to High
Blown fuses/tripped circuit breakers	Moderate to High
Neighborhood conditions: street noise; roads in need of repair; crime; trash, litter, junk in streets or on properties; boarded-up/abandoned structures; nonresidential activities; odors, smoke, gas	Moderate to High
Satisfactory neighborhood services: police protection; hospitals/health clinic; public transportation; shopping; elementary schools ..	Moderate to High
Electricity cost	Moderate to High
Oil, coal, kerosene, wood, or other fuel cost	Moderate to High
Fire/hazard insurance	Moderate to High
Cost of garbage collection	Moderate to High
Broken plaster or peeling paint on ceiling and walls	High
Working electric outlet in all rooms	High
Concealed wiring	High
Gas cost	High
Cost of water supply and sewage disposal	High
Gross income	High

A possible explanation for the results of the reinterview studies, as well as the surveys themselves, is that respondents may lack precise information. Also, since the results of the reinterview studies are derived from sample surveys, there is sampling error associated with these estimates of nonsampling error. The possibility of such errors should be taken into account when considering the results of these studies.

Coverage errors. In errors of coverage and estimation for missing data, the AHS new construction sample had deficiencies in the representation of conventional (nonmobile home or trailer) new construction. Because of time constraints, only those building permits issued more than 7 months before the survey ended were eligible to be sampled to represent conventional new construction in permit-issuing areas for each metropolitan area. However, those permits issued during the last 7 months of the survey do not necessarily represent missed housing units. Because of the relatively short time span involved, it is possible that construction of these housing units was not completed at the time the survey was conducted, in which case, they would not have been eligible for interview. In addition to these deficiencies, new construction in special places that do not require building permits, such as military bases, is not adequately represented.

AHS misses a significant portion of new mobile homes. It is believed that most of the difference is because of poor coverage of mobile home parks in address ED's. Undercoverage exists for those mobile homes built between the time of the last coverage improvement procedure and the 1980 census. It has been estimated that on a national level

as much as 25 percent of those mobile homes built after January 1, 1980, may be missed. Note that the mobile home ratio estimation procedure used was an attempt to correct for this deficiency. Deficiencies also exist in ED's where area sampling methods are used. It had been assumed that all housing units located inside these ED's would be represented in the sample. However, it has been established that the AHS sample missed as much as 2 percent of all housing units in these ED's because they were not listed during the canvassing. It should be noted that since these ED's were recanvassed each time this metropolitan area was surveyed, the number of missed housing units may be considerably less for the 1990 survey.

The mobile home and total housing unit ratio estimation procedures correct for these deficiencies as far as the count of mobile homes and total housing units is concerned (i.e., it adjusts to the best available estimate). However, biases of subtotals would still remain.

Rounding errors. For errors associated with processing, rounding of estimates introduces another source of error in the data, the severity of which depends upon the statistics being measured. The effect of rounding is significant relative to the sampling error only for small percentages or small medians when these figures are derived from relatively large bases (e.g., median number of persons per household). This means that confidence intervals formed from the standard errors given may be distorted, and this should be taken into account when considering the results of the survey.

Sampling errors for the AHS metropolitan area sample. The particular sample used for this survey is one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Even if the same questionnaires, instructions, and interviewers were used, estimates from each of the different samples would differ from one another. The sampling error of a survey estimate provides a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and, thus, is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a sample approximates the average result of all possible samples.

One common measure of the sampling error is the standard error. As calculated for this report, the standard error reflects the variation in the estimates caused by sampling and nonsampling errors, but it does not measure as such any systematic biases in the data. Therefore, the accuracy of the estimates depends upon the standard error, biases, and any additional nonsampling errors not measured by the standard error. The sample estimate and its estimated standard error enable one to construct interval estimates in which the interval includes the average result of all possible samples with a known probability. For example, if all possible samples were selected, each of

these surveyed under essentially the same general conditions, and an estimate and its estimated standard error were calculated from each sample, then—

Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.6 standard errors below the estimate to 1.6 standard errors above the estimate would include the average result of all possible samples.

The average result of all possible samples either is or is not contained in any particular computed interval. However, for a particular sample, one can say with specified confidence that the average result of all possible samples is included in the constructed interval.

The figures presented in the tables that follow (see page B-13) are approximations to the standard errors of various estimates shown in this report for this metropolitan area. In order to derive standard errors that would be applicable to a wide variety of items and also could be prepared at a moderate cost, a number of approximations were required. As a result, the tables of standard errors provide an indication of the order of magnitude of the standard errors rather than precise standard errors for any specific item.

Table I presents the standard errors applicable to estimates of characteristics of the 1990 housing inventory. Linear interpolation should be used to determine the standard errors for estimates not specifically shown in this table.

The reliability of an estimated percentage, computed by using the sample data for both numerator and denominator, depends upon both the size of the percentage and the size of the total upon which the percentage is based. Estimated percentages are relatively more reliable than the corresponding estimates of the numerators of the percentages, particularly if the percentages are 50 percent or more.

Table II presents the standard errors of estimated percentages for the 1990 housing inventory. Two-way interpolation should be used to determine standard errors for estimated percentages not specifically shown in these tables.

Included in tables I and II are estimates of standard errors for estimates of zero and zero percent. These estimates of standard errors are considered overestimates of the true standard errors and should be used primarily for construction of confidence intervals for characteristics when estimates of zero are obtained.

For ratios, 100 (x/y), where x is not a subclass of y, table II underestimates the standard error of the ratio when there is little or no correlation between x and y. For this type of ratio, a better approximation of the standard error may be obtained by letting the standard error of the ratio be approximately equal to:

$$(100) \frac{x}{y} \sqrt{\left(\frac{S_x}{x}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{S_y}{y}\right)^2}$$

where: x = the numerator of the ratio
 y = the denominator of the ratio
 S_x = the standard error of the numerator
 S_y = the standard error of the denominator insert

Illustration of the use of the standard error tables.

Table 2-1 of this report shows that in the Anaheim, CA, metropolitan area there were 501,700 owner-occupied housing units. Interpolation using table I of this appendix shows that the standard error of an estimate of this size is approximately 7,640. The following interpolation procedure was used.

The information presented in the following table was extracted from table I. The entry for "x" is the one sought.

Size of estimate	Standard error
500,000	7,650
501,700	X
600,000	7,240

The entry of "x" is determined as follows by vertically interpolating between 7,650 and 7,240.

$$\begin{aligned} 501,700 - 500,000 &= 1,700 \\ 600,000 - 500,000 &= 100,000 \\ 7,650 + \frac{1,700}{100,000} (7,240 - 7,650) &= 7,640 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the 90-percent confidence interval, as shown by these data, is from 489,480 to 513,920 housing units. Therefore, a conclusion that the average estimate, derived from all possible samples, of 1990 owner-occupied housing units lies within a range computed in this way would be correct for roughly 90 percent of all possible samples.

Table 2-3 also shows that of 501,700 owner-occupied housing units, 114,000 or 22.7 percent had two bedrooms. Interpolation using table II of this appendix (i.e., interpolation on both the base and percent) shows that the standard error of the 22.7 percent is approximately 1.0 percentage points. The following interpolation procedure was used.

The information presented in the following table was extracted from table II.

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage		
	10 or 90	22.7	25 or 75
500,000	0.7	a	1.0
501,700		p	
600,000	0.6	b	0.9

1. The entry for cell "a" is determined by horizontal interpolation between 0.7 and 1.0.

$$\begin{aligned} 22.7 - 10.0 &= 12.7 \\ 25.0 - 10.0 &= 15.0 \\ 0.7 + \frac{12.7}{15.0} (1.0 - 0.7) &= 1.0 \end{aligned}$$

2. The entry for cell "b" is determined by horizontal interpolation between 0.6 and 0.9.

$$\begin{aligned} 22.7 - 10.0 &= 12.7 \\ 25.0 - 10.0 &= 15.0 \\ 0.6 + \frac{12.7}{15.0} (0.9 - 0.6) &= 0.9 \end{aligned}$$

3. The entry for "p" is then determined by vertical interpolation between 1.0 and 0.9

$$\begin{aligned} 501,700 - 500,000 &= 1,700 \\ 600,000 - 500,000 &= 100,000 \\ 1.0 + \frac{1,700}{100,000} (0.9 - 1.0) &= 1.0 \end{aligned}$$

Applying a factor of 1.0 according to the footnote from table II gives a standard error of 1.0 percentage points. Consequently, the 90-percent confidence interval, as shown by these data, is from 21.1 to 24.3 percent.

Differences. The standard errors shown are not directly applicable to differences between two sample estimates. They are quite accurate for the difference between estimates of the same characteristics in two different metropolitan areas or the difference between separate and uncorrelated characteristics in the same metropolitan area. If there is a high positive correlation between the two characteristics, the formula will overestimate the true standard error; but if there is a high negative correlation, the formula will underestimate the true standard error.

Illustration of the computation of the standard error of a difference. Table 2-3 of this report shows that in the Anaheim, CA, metropolitan area there were 198,700 owner-occupied housing units with three bedrooms. Thus, the apparent difference, as shown by these data, between owner-occupied units with two bedrooms and owner-occupied units with three bedrooms is 84,700. Table I, with interpolation, shows that the standard error of 114,000 is approximately 5,100, and the standard error of 198,700 is approximately 6,400. Therefore, the standard error of the estimated difference of 84,700 is about 8,180.

$$8,180 = \sqrt{(5,100)^2 + (6,400)^2}$$

Consequently, the 90-percent confidence interval for the 84,700 difference is from 71,610 to 97,790 housing units. Therefore, a conclusion that the average estimate

derived from all possible samples, of this difference, lies within a range computed in this way would be correct for roughly 90 percent of all possible samples. Thus, we can conclude with 90-percent confidence that the number of 1990 owner-occupied housing units with three bedrooms is greater than the number of owner-occupied housing units with two bedrooms since the 90-percent confidence interval does not include zero or negative values.

Medians. For medians presented in certain tables, the sampling error depends on the size of the base and on the distribution upon which the median is based. An approximate method for measuring the reliability of the estimated median is to determine an interval about the estimated median so that there is a stated degree of confidence, such that the average median from all possible samples lies within the interval. The following procedure may be used to estimate confidence limits of a median based on sample data:

1. From table II, determine the standard error of a 50-percent characteristic on the base of the median.
2. Add to and subtract from 50 percent the standard error determined in step 1.
3. Using the distribution of the characteristics, determine the confidence interval corresponding to the two points established in step 2. To find the lower endpoint of the confidence interval, it is necessary to know into which interval of the distribution the lower percentage limit falls. Similarly, to find the upper end point of the confidence interval, it is necessary to know into which interval of the distribution the upper percentage limit falls. Note that these distribution intervals could be different, although this will not happen very often.

A 1.6 standard-error confidence interval may be determined by finding the values corresponding to 50 percent plus and minus 1.6 times the standard error determined in step 1. For about 90 out of 100 possible samples, the average median from all possible samples would lie between these two values.

Illustration of the computation of the 90-percent confidence interval of a median. Table 3-13 of this report shows the median monthly housing cost for owner-occupied housing units is \$1,046. The base of this distribution is obtained by subtracting "mortgage payment not reported" from the number of occupied units. Using this definition, the base is equal to 435,100.

1. Interpolation using table II and the applied factor (from footnote) shows that the standard error of 50 percent on a base of 435,100 is approximately 1.2 percentage points.

2. To obtain a 90-percent confidence interval on the estimated median, initially add to and subtract from 50 percent 1.6 times the standard error determined in step 1. This yields percentage limits of 48.1 and 51.9.
3. From the distribution for monthly housing cost in table 3-13, the \$800 to \$1,000 interval for owner-occupied housing units contains the 48.1 percent derived in step 2. About 176,400 housing units, or 40.5 percent, fall below this interval, and 33,300 housing units, or 7.7 percent, fall within this interval. By linear interpolation, the lower limit of the 90 percent confidence interval is found to be about \$997.

$$800 + (1,000 - 800) \frac{48.1 - 40.5}{7.7} = 997$$

4. Similarly, the \$1,000 to \$1,250 interval for owner-occupied housing units contains the 51.9 percent derived in step 2. About 209,700 housing units (48.2 percent) fall below this interval, and 43,500 housing units or 10.0 percent, fall within this interval. The upper limit of the 90-percent confidence interval is found to be about \$1,093.

$$1,000 + (1,250 - 1,000) \frac{51.9 - 48.2}{10.0} = 1,093$$

Thus, the 90-percent confidence interval ranges from \$997 to \$1,093.

5. Finally, note that the medians shown in this report are calculated from unrounded data and then rounded. Thus, they may differ from the medians calculated from the grouped data in the tables of this report.

Table I. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1990 Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA PMSA

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹			
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ⁴	Mobile homes ⁵
0.....	260	270	240	210
300.....	280	280	270	250
700.....	430	430	410	380
1,000.....	510	510	490	450
2,500.....	810	810	780	700
5,000.....	1,150	1,150	1,100	950
10,000.....	1,620	1,620	1,550	1,210
25,000.....	2,540	2,540	2,430	1,080
32,000.....	2,860	2,860	2,740	-
50,000.....	3,540	3,540	3,380	-
60,000.....	3,850	3,850	3,680	-
75,000.....	4,270	4,270	4,080	-
100,000.....	4,850	4,850	4,640	-
150,000.....	5,750	5,760	5,500	-
200,000.....	6,410	6,420	6,140	-
250,000.....	6,910	6,910	6,610	-
300,000.....	7,270	7,270	6,960	-
400,000.....	7,650	7,660	-	-
500,000.....	7,640	7,650	-	-
600,000.....	7,240	7,240	-	-
700,000.....	6,350	-	-	-
800,000.....	4,740	-	-	-
895,000.....	-	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.0 for owner housing units, 1.1 for renter housing units, and 1.0 for the combined owner and renter housing units.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁵For estimates pertaining to new construction mobile homes, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.2.

Table II. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1990 Housing Inventory of the Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA PMSA

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
300	44.7	44.7	44.7	44.7	44.7	45.0
700	25.7	25.7	25.7	25.7	25.7	29.4
1,000	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	21.3	24.6
2,500	8.8	8.8	8.8	9.3	13.5	15.6
5,000	4.6	4.6	4.8	6.6	9.5	11.0
10,000	2.4	2.4	3.4	4.7	6.7	7.8
25,000	1.0	1.0	2.1	3.0	4.3	4.9
32,000	0.8	0.9	1.9	2.6	3.8	4.4
50,000	0.5	0.7	1.5	2.1	3.0	3.5
60,000	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.8	3.2
75,000	0.3	0.6	1.2	1.7	2.5	2.8
100,000	0.2	0.5	1.1	1.5	2.1	2.5
150,000	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0
200,000	0.12	0.3	0.8	1.0	1.5	1.7
250,000	0.10	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.6
300,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.4
400,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.2
500,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
600,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
700,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
800,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9
895,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point.

For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

The following factors should be applied to estimates that do not pertain strictly to new construction. For estimates pertaining to both owners and renters, apply a factor of 1.0. For estimates pertaining to owner housing units, apply a factor of 1.0. For estimates pertaining to renter housing units, apply a factor of 1.0. For estimates pertaining to mobile homes, apply a factor of 1.0.