The Census 2000 Testing and Experimentation Program

August 27, 2003

Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies of Six Race/Ethnic Groups

FINAL REPORT

This research paper reports the results of research and analysis undertaken by the U.S. Census Bureau. It is part of a broad program, the Census 2000 Testing, Experimentation, and Evaluation (TXE) Program, designed to assess Census 2000 and to inform 2010 Census planning. Findings from the Census 2000 TXE Program reports are integrated into topic reports that provide context and background for broader interpretation of results.

Laurie Schwede
Statistical Research Division

U S C E N S U S B U R E A U
Helping You Make Informed Decisions

Intentionally Blank

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY v

1. BACKGROUND 1

1.1 Research on Complex Households 3
1.2 Demographic Trends and Complex Households 4
1.2.1 Increasing Immigration and Changing Characteristics of the Foreign Born 4
1.2.2 Large Increases in the Prevalence of Cohabiting Unmarried Partners 5
1.2.3 Large Increases in the Proportion of Cohabitor Households with Children 5
1.2.4 Increases in Remarriages and Blended Couple Households 6
1.2.5 Dramatic Increases in Grandparent-maintained Families 6
1.3 The Relationship Question 6
1.3.1 The Census 2000 Relationship Question 7
1.3.2 Purpose of the Relationship Question on the Census Form 7
1.3.3 The Number of Relationship Categories has Increased in Every Census Since 1970 7
1.3.4 The Relationship Question Categories Differ among Censuses, the ACS and the Current Population Survey, with Census 2000 Collecting the Most Data . . 12
1.3.5 Why Relationship Questions Vary over Time and Data Collections 15
1.3.6 Changes to the Relationship Question Need Pretesting 15
1.4 Household Type 15
1.4.1 Basic Census Bureau Household Types 16
1.4.2 A New Household Type: Multigenerational Households 16
1.4.3 Limitations of the New Household Type: Multigenerational Households 17
1.4.4 Relationship Categories are Used to Construct the Household Type Variable Distinguishing Married Couple Households from Other Family Households . . 17

2. METHODS 18

2.1 Selection of Ethnographers and Ethnic Groups for this Study 18
2.2 The First Ethnographic Conference 19
2.3 Selection of Respondents in the Six Study Sites 21
2.4 Development of the Interview Protocol and other Materials 22
2.5 Ethnographic Interviews 22
2.6 Second Ethnographic Conference and Statistical Research Division Colloquium on Complex Households 24
2.7 Ethnographic Interviews 24
2.8 Reports, Data, and Videotape from this Project 24
2.9 Followup Research 24

3. LIMITS 25

4. RESULTS 26

4.1 The Range and Functioning of Complex Households in the Six Ethnic Groups 26
4.1.1 Navajo Complex Households 27
4.1.1.1. Mobility, Residential Ambiguity and Frequent Shifts in Household Type 27
4.1.1.2. Definition of Household 32
4.1.1.3. Matrilineal Kinship System and Relationship Categories Differing from those of Mainstream American Society 35
4.1.2 Inupiaq Complex Households 36
4.1.2.1. Multigenerational Household Type is the Norm 39
4.1.2.2. Informal and Formal Adoption 40
4.1.3 Latino Complex Households 42
4.1.3.1. Definition of Household 43
4.1.3.2. Language Issues 44
4.1.3.3. Latino Naming Customs Differ from Those in Mainstream American Culture 48
4.1.3.4. Cultural Issues in Determining Who Should be Person one on the Census Form 49
4.1.3.5. Mobility in and out of Households and Who is Considered a Household Member 51
4.1.3.6. Permanence of Complex Households 52
4.1.4 Korean Complex Households 53
4.1.4.1. Definition of Household 54
4.1.4.2 "Social Face" and Social Desirability 55
4.1.4.3. Mobility 56
4.1.4.4. Cultural Differences in Use of Relationship Terms 56
4.1.4.5. Person one 57
4.1.4.6. Reasons for Living in a Complex Household 57
4.1.5 Rural White Complex Households 59
4.1.5.1. Unmarried Partner, Common Law Partner, and Husband/Wife 61
4.1.5.2. Relationships of Children with Adults 63
4.1.5.3. Relationship of Adopted, Step and Other Children to Parent 64
4.1.5.4. Fictive Kin 64
4.1.5.5. Definition of Household 65
4.1.5.6. Reasons for Living in a Complex Household 65
4.1.5.7. Mobility in and out of Households since Census Day 66
4.1.6 African American Complex Households 69
4.1.6.1. Definition of Household 71
4.1.6.2. Person One 73
4.1.6.3. Ambiguous Residence 74
4.1.6.4. Reasons for Living in a Complex Household 74

4.2 How Well the Census Relationship Question and Categories Captures the Emerging Diversity of Household Types 75
4.2.1 Limitations of the Method of Reckoning All Relationships Just to Person One 75
4.2.2 The Number and Types of Relationships Specified in Stand-alone Response Categories Limit the Types of Complex Households that can be Identified . . 79
4.2.3 The Absence of Definitions/Instructions for Cohabitors on Choosing Relationships May Lead to Inconsistencies in Marking "Husband/Wife" and "Unmarried Partner" Relationships and Reduced Congruence with Official Definitions that may Affect Household Type 80
4.2.4 The Relationship Questions are not Always Mutually Exclusive 82
4.2.5 Two new Relationship Categories 83
4.3 Wider Issues Identified in this Study 84
4.3.1 Selected Cultural, Linguistic, and Nationality Differences with Census Concepts, Methods, and Procedures 85
4.3.1.1. Latino Naming Customs 85
4.3.1.2. Navajo Matrilineal Kinship System and Different Kinship Terms . . 85
4.3.1.3. Inupiaq Customs of Grandparents Formally or Informally Adopting their Grandchildren 86
4.3.2. Language Issues and the Need for Pretesting Translated Forms 86
4.3.3 Conceptual Differences in the Definition and Application of "Household" . 89
4.3.4 Mobility Patterns and Respondent Conceptions of Who to List may not Match our Basic Residence Rule Concept of "Usual Residence" 89
4.3.5. Fear and Mistrust of the Government and Response 91

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 92
5.1 Summary 92
5.2 Conclusions and Recommendations 92
5.2.1 Recommended Revisions to the Relationship Question. 94
5.2.2 Recommendations for New Research on the Relationship Question and Household Type 96
5.2.3 Recommendations on Language and Translation Issues 97
5.2.4 Recommendations on Outreach and Training 98
5.2.5 Recommendations for New Research Related to Coverage and Residence Rules 99

6. REFERENCES CITED IN THE REPORT 102

Appendix A: Example of Individual-level Question to Collect All Household Interrelationships on a Household on a Mailout Form: 2001 England Household Form. 110
Appendix B: Complex Household Project Interviewing Protocol 111
Appendix C: Reports from the 1990 Ethnographic Evaluation of the Behavioral Causes of Undercount Project 121
Appendix D: Reports, Poster, and Videotape from this Complex Households Project 125

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Relationship Categories in the 1970, 1980, 1990 Censuses and in Census 2000 9
Table 2. Breakdowns of the "Other Relative" Write-Ins on the Relationship Question in Census 2000 11
Table 3. Comparison of Relationship Categories in the 1990 Census, Census 2000 the American Community Survey, and the Current Population Survey 14
Table 4. The Six Ethnographic Studies: Race/Ethnic groups, Ethnographers, and Research Sites 19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

> Racial and ethnic minorities are becoming a proportionately larger component of the population. In 2000, slightly more than one of ten people in the United States was foreign born. This growing cultural diversity will continue to bring new challenges to how the Census Bureau conducts its work. It will affect the methods the Census Bureau uses to collect information, the questions asked, and the presentation of data (U.S. Census Bureau Strategic Plan FY 2004 - 2008: 22).

In the 1960s, the most common household type in this country was "married couple family with children." The television shows of that time, Ozzie and Harriet, and Leave it to Beaver, consisted of children who were living with both of their biological parents who were formally married to each other. These are commonly referred to as "nuclear families." Household structure has been changing and diversifying since the 1960s. By 2000, "married couple family with children" was no longer the modal household type and the Ozzie and Harriet type of family was no longer typical of mainstream society. Questions can be raised as to whether this type of family was, or is, the modal pattern for some ethnic subpopulations.

Household structure is changing in this country as a result of the growing cultural diversity mentioned in the quote from the Census Bureau's Strategic Plan above as well as other factors. Some important trends that may affect household structure include: increases in immigration; changing migration streams now coming predominantly from Latin America and Asia, rather than from Europe; increases in divorce, remarriages, blended families and cohabiting couples, and children living with them; and increases in grandparent-maintained households and nonrelative households.

Recognizing that household structure is changing and that it varies among different race/ethnic groups and over time, the Census Bureau funded exploratory ethnographic research in the spring of 2000 to learn more about non-nuclear, or complex, households and to identify ways we might improve enumeration of them. This research project, "Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies of Six/Race Ethnic Groups," was funded as part of the Census 2000 Testing and Experimentation Program.

This study identifies and describes complex households in selected ethnic groups in the United States, falling into the official Office of Management and Budget categories of African-American, American Indian and/or Alaska Native, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and non-Hispanic white. The specific ethnic groups studied include Korean immigrants in Queens, New York, one location of the upcoming 2004 census site test (Kang 2000); Latino immigrants in central Virginia (Blumberg and Goerman 2000); African Americans in southeastern Virginia (Holmes and Amissah 2002); rural non-Hispanic whites in western New York (Hewner 2000); Navajo Indians on the Arizona reservation (Tongue 2000); and Inupiaq Eskimos, known as the Inupiat, in Alaska (Craver 2000).[1]

---

[1] The spelling of the name of this group changes, depending on whether the name is used as an adjective or a noun. When used as a noun for the ethnic group, the proper name is "Inupiat." When used as an adjective, the proper spelling is "Inupiaq," as in Inupiaq Eskimos.

This ethnographic research project and report has three aims. The first is to explore the range and functioning of complex households within different ethnic groups. The second is to examine how well the response categories of the decennial relationship question capture the emerging diversity of household types in this country. The third aim has three components: a) to assess how well census methods, questions, relationship categories and household composition typologies describe the emerging diversity of household types, b) to suggest revisions to the relationship question and response categories for the 2010 census test cycle; and c) to call for new research.

The report begins with background information on diversification of household types that has occurred in household structure since the 1960s and identifies some of the demographic trends contributing to these changes. The purposes of including the relationship question on the census form are discussed and the importance of this question in constructing the variable, "household type," is described. The steadily increasing number and specificity of relationship question categories from seven in the 1970 census, through nine in 1980 and eleven in 1990, to fifteen in Census 2000 is documented. Three critical differences between the two major Census Bureau data collections–Census 2000 and the American Community Survey–in terms of lists of relationship response categories are identified. First, the American Community Survey relationship question has just one category for "child" while the census relationship question has three categories: natural-born, step, and adopted child. Second, the American Community Survey has one category for in-laws while the census differentiates parents-in-law from sons-in-law/daughters-in-law, showing generational differences that would be masked in the American Community Survey data. Third, the American Community Survey has an "other relative" category, but no write-in line, while the census question has both the "other relative" category and the write-in line. The more specific census data in these three areas thus enables stakeholders, policy makers and other data users to do more in-depth analysis of relationships and household types than they could do with American Community Survey relationship data.

The concept of complex households is introduced with a brief literature review on this topic. The complex households research project and its methods are described.

The results section starts with targeted ethnographic descriptive summaries related to complex households for each of the six ethnic groups. It is followed by a section discussing issues and limitations identified specifically with the relationship question and household types. The next section identifies and discusses four important themes running through the studies during the course of the project, and a final section provides recommendations for revisions to questions and methods, new training and outreach modules, as well as suggestions for new research.

The overall project was designed to have experienced ethnographers already immersed in six different race/ethnic communities conduct exploratory ethnographic studies of complex households using the same methods and the same core questions at the same time in the late spring of 2000. Twenty five complex household interviews were conducted in each ethnic community between May and July of 2000, as soon after Census Day (April 1, 2000) as possible

without adversely affecting ongoing Census Bureau nonresponse followup interviews. A new African American study was commissioned in 2002 as a result of methodological issues with the first study done in 2000.

The author originally proposed the idea for this research and developed the general definition of "complex households." She co-managed the complex household project with Dr. Anna Chan and they jointly developed the overall research questions and methods for the project. They also developed a semi-structured protocol of core questions–with input from the ethnographers–and a relationship grid, and provided mock census forms with specified questions for respondents to complete. Latino and Korean immigrants were given mock census forms in their native languages to complete and were interviewed in those languages, if they wished. Each ethnographer selected 25 complex households that he/she felt represented the range of complex households within his/her ethnic group and conducted in-person interviews. They analyzed their data, presented their results at the Census Bureau, and submitted final reports.

This overall project report summarizes 1) the development, implementation, analysis and results from this Complex Households Project for all six of the component ethnographic studies, 2) our review of the literature and our knowledge of other Census 2000 research, and 3) our knowledge of research and planning for the 2010 census. Stand-alone executive summaries and final reports for each of the six component ethnographic studies by the individual ethnographers will be available on request.

The category of "complex households" is not an official Census Bureau household type. It is a category developed by Census Bureau researchers to refer to households that differ from the norm in terms of the types of relatives and/or nonrelatives living there as well as to those with living situations that may make accurate enumeration difficult. We developed this working definition of complex households during the project planning stage:

> Complex households are those where the web of relationships within the household is other than one nuclear family (i.e., nuclear family being married couple with or without its own biological children) that may be difficult to describe using census categories based on the single nuclear family model. Complex households may have relatives that do not fit into the typical Census Bureau response categories of parent, spouse, biological child, or biological sibling. Examples include, but are not limited to: nonrelatives; unmarried partners; gay partners; more distant kin such as grandparents, cousins, uncles, etc.; classificatory kin; fictive kin; children or others who are shared across households; people who may be mobile or ambiguous in terms of household membership; etc. Households that have one nuclear family plus any other person or persons, including those who made up two nuclear families, also may be complex households.

The official Census Bureau category used in data products and reports for household composition is "Household Type." Household type is not asked directly of respondents. This variable is constructed from answers on census and survey forms to the relationship, sex, and age questions. Relationships are most often collected in censuses and surveys by asking how each person is related to Person One on the questionnaire.

Five major themes have been identified in this research. They include: 1) issues with the relationship question and the household type variable; 2) cultural, linguistic, and nationality differences with census concepts, methods, and procedures; 3) conceptual differences in the definition and application of the key census concept of "household;" 4) mobility patterns and respondents' conceptions of who is a household member that may not match our fundamental census residence rule concept of "usual residence;" and 5) fear and mistrust of the government and pledges of confidentiality.

Issues with the relationship question and household type variable

Four types of issues and/or limitations were identified with the relationship question and with household type in this study. The first is associated with the method of asking relationships to Person One only. The second has to do with the number and types of relationships that are specified in response categories. The third issue revolves around the absence of definitions and/or instructions in the relationship question to inform respondents in different types of cohabiting relationships of the appropriate relationship category to mark for their partners: "husband/wife" or "unmarried partner." One's initial reaction would likely be that all cohabiting partners should be marked as "unmarried partners," but this doesn't take into account the legal category in some states of "common law marriage" for unmarried couples who have lived together for a specified number of years. Our official Census Bureau definition of "married couple" includes persons in "common law marriages," but this definition is not fully operationalized because it does not appear on the census form. The absence of guidelines means that respondents will interpret the categories according to their own individual and cultural frames of reference and the resulting inconsistencies in the data may reduce the validity and reliability of census data on relationships, marital status, and household type. The fourth issue is that relationship categories are not always mutually exclusive.

1. The method of asking for relationships only with respect to Person One has three limitations identified in this study.

   First, interrelationships among other persons in the household can be masked and not be identifiable either from the census form itself or in the data we produce. Second, the classification of household type may change, sometimes dramatically, depending on who is listed as Person One, possibly distorting the distribution of household types that are used in developing programs, implementing the poverty definition, and allocating funding. Third, we may not be able to ascertain whether Person Two is the biological parent of a coresident child.

One rural white household where a woman lives with her child and her unmarried partner illustrates the first two problems. If she is listed as Person One, this is classified as a female householder family household. If he is listed as Person One (as actually happened), both the woman and her child are marked as nonrelatives, masking the parent-child relationship between Persons two and three. Now the same household is categorized as a male householder nonfamily household. Thus, both the family/nonfamily and the female householder/male householder classification dimensions can vary for the same household, depending on which adult is listed as Person One on the census form. This is not a rare case: we had a number of unmarried partner households with coresident children among our ethnic study groups.

The third problem is illustrated when the woman in this household is Person One; we learn she is the mother of the child, but we cannot learn the relationship of Person Two to the child. He could be a nonrelative, but then again he could be her biological father; she could be living with both biological parents in a female householder family household! Those who use census data to identify the numbers and characteristics of female householder families need to keep in mind in their analyses that "female householder families" can and do include adult men who may be social and/or biological parents of children in the household; they are just not the *husbands* of the female householders. A "female householder family" is not necessarily the same as a "woman-headed household" with no adult male present.

Inconsistencies in the classification of households and masking of interrelationships in some cases, depending on who is listed as Person One on a census or survey form, are a source of error that may skew our distributions of household type that are used in implementing poverty definitions and in allocating funds in federal programs.

There is a way to overcome these problems resulting from collecting relationships to Person One only. We recommend development and testing of an individual-level question, along the lines of the England census form question in order to identify all interrelationships in the household.

2. The number and types of relationships that are specified in stand-alone response categories set limits on the types of complex households that can be identified.

   The relationship categories used by the Census Bureau reflect the relationships in our society deemed most important to specifically delineate at the time of each census as well as our norms for household composition. These categories express relationships based on kinship, marriage, and cohabitation, and on economic (e.g., housemate/roommate) and/or legal ties (e.g., adopted child, foster child).

   In the 1970 Census, just five specific relationship categories were printed: household head, wife, child, roomer/boarder/lodger, and inmate/patient. Since then our country has

diversified and every subsequent decennial census has had an increase in the number of relationship types deemed important to identify with their own stand-alone response categories (see Table 1). Most of these added categories were to further delineate relationships in nuclear families and blended families, and to identify grandchildren and unmarried partners. With Census 2000 data, Population Division analysts were able to write the first report on multi-generational households in this country; it has a *lineal* focus on households with grandparent, parent/parent-in-law, child/child-in-law, and grandchild.

While we have been making steady progress in capturing more diverse *lineal* household types, we have just begun to explore more diverse *lateral* living arrangements with relatives such as adult siblings, brothers-in-law/sisters-in-law, nephews/nieces, cousins, and uncles/aunts. Evidence to support expanding the relationship categories to specify more lateral relationships comes from our complex households ethnographic study as well as from our analysis of tabulations of Census 2000 data produced by Population Division analysts.

- Results from this ethnographic study of complex households in six race/ethnic groups identify both *lineal* and *lateral* extended family households. For example, a number of the Latino households were both lineally and laterally extended, including respondents' parents, respondents' siblings, and/or brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, nephews, nieces, and cousins. Some Navajo households included adult siblings, nieces and nephews and/or grandparents and some African American households included great nieces and nephews, adult siblings, and cousins.

- Results from analysis of tabulations of Census 2000 relationship question write-in data also suggest the need to add new lateral relationship categories to the 2010 census form. Using data provided by Population Division, we calculated that 51.4 percent of the Census 2000 relationship question write-ins were for the laterally extended kin categories including nephew/niece, brother-in-law/sister-in-law, cousin, uncle/aunt, and an additional 1.8 percent were for the lineally extended category of grandparent. In all 53.2 percent of the write-ins were for categories that delineate lateral and lineal relationships.

3. The absence of definitions or instructions for cohabitors on choosing proper relationships for partners may lead to inconsistencies in marking "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" congruent with our official definitions, possibly reducing the quality of data on relationships and affecting the distribution of household types.

There are three factors that may contribute to this: the first has to do with our categories on the form not fully operationalizing our official concepts; the second has to do with different cultural interpretations of the meanings and connotations of "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" in some subpopulations; and the third has to do with social desirability and consequent unwillingness of some cohabiting persons to mark "unmarried partner" on a questionnaire. To the extent that respondents mark categories other than "unmarried partner" we may get inaccurate counts of married couples relative to other families.

- First, according to the Census 2000 Technical Documentation, "married couple" includes "spouses" who are in formal marriages and in common law marriages, but this definition does not appear on the census form, and there is no response category for "common law husband/wife." The official definition is thus not fully operationalized on the census form. The line separating married couple from unmarried couple is blurred and subject to variation in interpretation by respondents as well as by data users and policy makers. Faced with a choice of "husband/wife" or "unmarried partner" some common law partners may mark "husband/wife," others might mark "unmarried partner," or something else, or leave it blank. Inconsistencies in responses may bias the distributions.

- Second, there may be cultural connotations of the terms, "husband" and "wife," that may not necessarily be bound to formal marriages. Respondents who are cohabiting may differ in their choice of relationship category to mark–husband/wife, unmarried partner, roommate/housemate, or other relative–reducing the consistency and quality of the data. Among the Navajos, "husband/wife" means "the one I make my living with," not necessarily the one to whom I am formally married. And among Latinos, there was variation in whether the words used on the Spanish language version of the census form, *esposo/esposa*, are used solely for couples who are formally married or also include unmarried couples. This is also a cultural and linguistic issue. Rural white cohabiting respondents differed in how they answered this question, with fewer than half marking "unmarried partner."

- Third, there were two cases where respondents were unwilling to mark the unmarried partner category, revealing they were cohabiting: one in the rural white study and the other in the Korean study. Social desirability and unwillingness to admit to cohabitation may be a factor.

4. Relationship categories are not always mutually exclusive

When more than one relationship category can be marked, the choice of one or the other may cause household type to vary and sometimes to be masked. The primary example comes from Inupiaq grandparents following cultural traditions and informally or formally adopting their grandchildren: they can mark either grandchild or adopted child. If adopted child is marked, the household appears to consist of two generations: parents and children. If grandchild is chosen, the household is shown to be a skip generation household. There are Navajo cases like this and one Latino case of biological relatives marked as *hijo de crianza* (for foster child). Our guidelines say that a legal relationship takes precedence over a biological one. This practice of marking "adopted child" for grandchildren or other relatives could result in underestimates of the number of skip generation households in censuses and surveys, particularly for the Inupiat, where this practice of adopting children is common. Adoption (usually informal) also was common among the African American and rural white samples. In short, adoptions were a source of (possible) ambiguity in all our samples except among Koreans (where it is not a cultural tradition).

Cultural, linguistic, and nationality differences with census concepts, methods, and procedures

There are cultural, linguistic, and perhaps nationality differences with census concepts, methods, and procedures that need to be identified, explored and taken into account when developing forms, methods, training, and procedures.

Most of the body of this report is devoted to ethnographic descriptions of the six ethnic groups included in the complex households study. Some of the important cultural, linguistic, and nationality differences identified in the body of this report include:

- Latino naming customs

  Each Latino person has two *last* names: the name of one's father (the principal surname) and the name of one's mother. There is more variation for Latinas; some continue to use their father's name as their principal surname, while others may add their husband's name, preceded by "de." The child would use both of his parents' fathers' names; this may result in the mother, father and child in the same household all having different surnames on a census form. There is not enough space on the census form name line for Latinos to record their full names and respondents may vary in which names they record. These differences in naming customs and how they may not be consistently applied on census forms may lead to difficulties and errors in matching Latinos in reinterviews and coverage evaluations. If matching rates for Latinos and non-Latinos differ, this might be a contributing factor.

- Navajo matrilineal kinship system and different kinship terms

  The Navajo kinship system distinguishes relationships on the male and female sides that are not found in the bilateral kinship system of mainstream society or on the census form. In the Navajo system, paternal grandparents are not the lateral equivalent of maternal grandparents; they have different relationship terms, e.g., "nali" for paternal grandchild(ren) and "tsui" for maternal grandchild(ren). Other maternal and paternal relatives also have non-parallel kinship terms. To deal with the typical census relationship categories such as "grandchild," Navajos first have to determine which side the grandchild is on before deciding what relationship category to mark, sometimes writing in "nali" or "tsui" on the other relative line, other times leaving the question blank. Ethnographer Tongue notes that when "grandchild" was checked by respondents on the mock census forms during her interviews, it inevitably meant the child of one's daughter, a "tsui," never a "nali." This could lead to misclassification of relationships for kin on the paternal side in the Navajo data.

  There are other matrilineal, as well as patrilineal, American Indian tribes that may have similar mismatches between native and mainstream relationship categories. Special training of enumerators is needed to identify these cultural differences and to handle them in a

culturally appropriate manner to get data consistent with those from mainstream American households.

- Inupiaq customs of grandparents formally or informally adopting their grandchildren, previously discussed.

- Latino and Korean immigrants did not understand the terms "foster child" and "adopted child" as intended, because the terms relate to specific socio-legal institutions in this country that are not found in their home countries.

  The ethnographic studies of immigrant Latinos and immigrant Koreans show that "foster child" and "adopted child" are culture-bound terms that apply to specific social and legal institutions in the United States that may either not exist in other countries, or mean something different, leading to issues of cross-cultural validity. The primary example is the use of *hijo de crianza* for foster child on the Spanish language version of the Census 2000 form. A Latino marked *hijo de crianza* instead of writing in niece and nephew for his sisters' children who were living with him. According to the ethnographers, the Spanish term, *hijo de crianza,* refers to a child one is raising for a friend or relative and has no connotation of the English term, "foster child," of taking in an unrelated child from a government agency with regular payments for that child's care. Carrasco documented the same finding in two studies: one with Spanish-speaking respondents and the other with bilingual Census Bureau field representatives (Carrasco 2000). We may be getting overcounts of foster children in Latino households because of cross-cultural and linguistic differences in the meaning of foster child and *hijo de crianza*. Perhaps at least part of the anomaly in the 10 to 15 percent of foster children who were age 18 or older in Census 2000 is due to this problem with *hijo de crianza*. In the Korean study, Kang said some of his respondents were confused by the concept of foster child in either Korean or English for two reasons: first, Korea has no such institutional system, and second, foster child was translated as "child under trusteeship" (Kang 2000), which confused the Korean respondents.

  Relationship terms have evolved in the context of mainstream American culture and institutions and may not be easily translatable into foreign language versions of the census form. Literal translations of key terms into Spanish, Korean, and other target languages can lead to reporting errors. Special care needs to be taken in translating conceptually rather than literally, and in conducting cognitive pretesting of foreign language versions of forms to determine if translated terms are functionally equivalent before they are used in live censuses.

  As mentioned above, the words *esposo/esposa* used on the Spanish language version of the Census 2000 form may not always be equated with the English terms "husband/wife." There may be dialectal differences in the usage of these terms between countries. Also, the word used for household ("*hogar*") on the Spanish language census form connoted just nuclear family to some respondents. This raises questions as to whether "hogar" is functionally equivalent to "household" among Latinos from different countries. Research is needed.

Conceptual differences in the definition and application of a key census term, "household"

There is a mismatch between the census definition of "household" and the definitions of respondents in different ethnic and cultural groups that may lead to miscounting and misclassification of household types. The Census Bureau definition basically says that a household consists of all of the people who live in one housing unit. The number of households therefore equals the number of occupied housing units. In this study, we found that many Navajo and Inupiaq respondents do not identify households in terms of shared physical structure, but rather on the basis of sharing of domestic functions such as earning and pooling income, cooperating in subsistence activities, cooking, child care, child raising, and other domestic tasks. Emotional closeness is also a key component in determining who is part of one's household. The ethnographers document cases of "households without walls" where persons from more than one housing unit identify themselves as one household as well as the converse: people sharing one housing unit who consider themselves to be separate households. This ambiguity in the boundaries of "household" has been documented by anthropologists, sociologists, economists, and others.

Mobility patterns and respondents' conceptions of who is a household member may not match our fundamental census residence rule concept of "usual residence"

All six ethnographic summaries in the body of this report include cases in which mobility patterns led to ambiguity between the household membership status from the perspective of the respondents and the official membership status according to the census residence rules. We have both *de jure* residence rules, that count people at their "usual residence" where they are most of the time, regardless of where they are physically staying on Census Day, and *de facto* residence rules for certain places and situations that dictate they must be counted there on Census Day, regardless of where they feel they belong or where they live most of the time. There is thus a fundamental contradiction in our residence rules between where one lives most of the time and where one is staying on one particular day. There are situations in which it is possible for a person to be counted correctly in two places at once. Finally, a respondent's opinion of where he/she may "belong" may not match either our *de jure* or *de facto* rules, possibly leading to census coverage errors.

We identified the following mobility patterns for households in this study:

- long-distance cyclical mobility to and from Navajo and Inupiaq households for temporary wage labor jobs;

- cross-national cyclical mobility between households in Latin America and Latino households in Virginia for wage labor jobs;

- seasonal cyclical mobility for subsistence activities among the Inupiat or to escape cold winters among rural whites called "snowbirds;"

- mobility for purposes of higher education, found in most of the samples;

- frequent movement of children among households for the Navajo and Inupiat for schooling and other purposes and for joint custody among rural whites;

- cyclic movement of elderly persons between their own houses and their relatives' houses (Navajo) and among households of adult children (African American);

- sporadic movements of tenuously attached persons (African American); and

- temporary ad hoc moves of indeterminate length into the houses of sick and/or elderly relatives who can no longer manage for themselves (rural whites and Inupiat).

The nature and duration of such moves as well as the anchor household respondents' interpretation of who is a household member may cause ambiguities in determining where a person should be counted in the census. It is sometimes not easy to apply census residence rules to determine where mobile persons should be counted; on the one hand, the respondent identifies them as household members who live there, but on the other, the persons are not physically staying there "most of the time." The text describes a number of anomalous cases in which the determination of residence as where one "belongs" may not fit the census residence rule of where one lives "most of the time" or where one is staying on Census Day.

There is wide recognition in the Census Bureau that some of the census residence rules may be a barrier to full and accurate enumeration. There has been considerable research on this since at least the early 1990s and there is an interdivisional working group examining the rules and considering revisions to them for the next census. One of us is a member.

Fear and mistrust of the government and pledges of confidentiality

Fear and/or mistrust of government and its pledges of confidentiality were themes that ran through the recruitment, completion of mock census forms by respondents, and interviewing in the Navajo, immigrant Korean, immigrant Latino, and African American ethnographic studies. This may relate to discussions of correlation bias in coverage evaluations resulting from persons being missed in both the census and in the coverage followup study. Tongue and Kang had the most difficulty in recruiting and completing interviews, even though they both used well-known and respected local Navajo and Korean community leaders as cultural liaisons (Tongue 2000 and Kang 2000). In two cases, Kang was thrown out of the apartments during interviews by relatives of the respondents who insisted the interviews be terminated immediately! Kang documented several cases where respondents omitted persons

from the mock census forms who should have been included because of fear of deportation or fear of losing either leases restricting the number of residents or government benefits. Some Latinos were very concerned about rumors that the Immigration and Naturalization Service would get access to census forms and expel them from the country. Holmes (2000) reports that many African Americans believe that mainstream Americans looks down on their household structure and consequently, they are mistrustful of government efforts to learn who lives with them and skeptical about the uses of the data.

We also found evidence of underreporting of children among the Latinos and some African American households that might have been related to fears of losing housing with strict limits on the number of permitted residents, or uncertainty as to whether they should be counted. Further, some Navajo and Latino respondents were not sure if children should be counted and did not list some children on their mock census forms. This is consistent with estimates in the 1990 census of large undercounts of children in Indian reservation households and in rural Latino renter households (West and Robinson 1999). It parallels findings on undercounts of young children in England (Chambers, Brown and Diamond 2002).

These findings point to the need for more detailed analyses of correlation bias for ethnic populations and for children, especially for immigrants since the September 11 attacks. Goerman speculates that there might be fewer illegal children entering the country because tightened restrictions at borders may make passage more difficult and more illegal immigrants might leave their children in the home country.

Key recommendations are made in the following five areas: revisions to and pretesting of the relationship question; new research on the relationship question and household type; language and translation issues; outreach and training; and new ethnographic research related to coverage.

1. Recommended Revisions to and Pretesting of the Relationship Question

- **Expand the number and precision of response categories in the relationship question to reflect the growing cultural diversity of this country and its household composition in the new millenium.** This recommendation is consistent with the Census Bureau's pattern in every decennial census since 1970 of expanding the number and precision of relationship categories to better reflect demographic changes in the population. It is also consistent with the Census Bureau's new Strategic Plan for 2004-2008 that recognizes that increasing racial and ethnic diversity:

  ...will continue to bring new challenges to how the Census Bureau conducts its work. It will affect the methods the Census Bureau uses to collect information, the questions asked, and the presentation of data. (Census Bureau 2002: 22).

It is also consistent with recommendations from Population Division.

We believe these reasons are compelling enough to justify the additional space these categories will require on the 2010 census form where we know that "real estate" is very precious and extra space is hard to come by.

- **Add niece/nephew, aunt/uncle, cousin, brother-in-law/sister-in-law, and grandparent as specific response categories for relatives in the relationship question to better reflect the range of complex households.** There are three very compelling reasons to add these five relative categories to the relationship question for 2010 census pretesting: time and cost savings resulting from fewer write-in answers to recode; the provision of more precise and accurate delineations of lineally and laterally extended family household types for data users; and respondent friendliness–checking a box is easier than writing a relationship in.

- **Add "child of unmarried partner" as a specific nonrelative response category to obtain more accurate information on the numbers and types of unmarried households with children.** This will mitigate, to some extent, the problem of underestimating the number of families in unmarried couple households. This is a result of the method of reckoning relationships to Person One only, and occurs when Person One is the nonparental unmarried partner, masking the parent-child relationship between Persons two and three.

- **If consistency between the census short form and the American Community Survey form questions is a priority for 2010, modify the new American Community Survey question to match the decennial short form, not vice versa.** As shown in Table 3, the American Community Survey relationship question has even fewer relationship categories than the census form; it cannot distinguish among types of children or types of in-laws, and doesn't allow an "other relative" write-in line. This puts severe limitations on the types of complex households that can be identified with American Community Survey data.

- **Design research and conduct semi-structured interviews on an expanded list of relationship terms, develop new wording for relationship terms, particularly for persons in custodial care, and conduct cognitive testing.** This already has been approved and research has commenced.

- **Conduct a split-panel test using three alternative versions of the relationship question and response categories in the 2005 Content Test.** Use the Census 2000 version as a control, with two experimental versions: the American Community Survey version (which has never been cognitively tested) and the version recommended above, with some additional modifications suggested by Population Division. The recommendation for this split-panel test was made to the 2010 Content Research and Development Working Group by Schwede last summer and has been accepted and incorporated into the 2005 test cycle.

2. Recommendations for New Research on the Relationship Question and Household Type

- **Design new research to develop and test an individual-level question on a mailout form to identify all interrelationships in the household, not just relationship to Person One, as was already done on the 2001 England household census form, shown in Appendix A.** Collecting all interrelationships in the household could solve all problems resulting from reckoning relationships to Person One only: masking of interrelationships, dramatic variations in basic household type in terms of family/nonfamily and/or male/female householder type (depending on who is listed as Person One), and lack of ability to identify both biological parents in unmarried and some married couple households. We are quite aware that this would be a big change and that this new way of collecting relationships would likely take up more space on the census form, but we think the potential payoff in accuracy of relationships and household types justifies at least preliminary question development and testing.

- **Design quantitative and qualitative research to assess how accurately the relationship categories of "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" differentiate married couple, male householder, and female householder household types by comparing with actual marital status.** Ethnographic data from our rural white, Hispanic, and Navajo studies suggest we might want new research to examine underlying assumptions that answers of "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" to the relationship question are valid and reliable indicators of marital status for the construction of Household Type. We recommend:

  Conducting quantitative testing of the goodness of fit between answers to the marital status question and answers of "husband/wife," "unmarried partner," and other nonrelative categories to the relationship question for different race groups, using Census 2000 unedited long form data files. At present these data are available only in state-level files and a national level file would need to be developed for this analysis.

  Conducting qualitative exploratory research on the meanings of marital status and associated relationship terms in different ethnic groups and how differences in the meanings and usages of these terms affect the validity of the household type variable that distinguishes "married couple" families from "other families." We would include respondents in unmarried couple relationships of long (common law marriages) and shorter durations, as well as those formally married. Some same sex unmarried couples could be included. According to our Census 2000 Technical Documentation, "married couple" refers to spouses in formal marriages as well as common law marriages. However, the term "common law partner" does not appear anywhere on the census form; this suggests a possible disconnect between our official definition and respondents' definition of marriage.

  Additional questions for research might include: Do legal definitions of "common law marriage" differ among states? Could we develop a new relationship category for "common law partner?" How do differences between "common law partner" and "unmarried partner"

affect the validity of the household type variable, distinguishing "married couple" families from other families?

Conducting cognitive testing with semi-structured followup questions to compare answers persons give to standard marital and relationship survey questions with answers they give to retrospective questions designed to ascertain whether persons are formally married or not as well as how long they had been living together.

3. Recommendations on Language and Translation Issues

- **Increase the scope and size of the new "Language Research" and "Translating Demographic Surveys" projects to identify linguistic, cultural, cognitive, and methodological issues in developing foreign language versions of census and survey forms and develop and test improved foreign language forms.**

- Conduct cross-national linguistic research on possible differences in the usage of key relationship terms, such as "*esposo/esposa*" (spouse) and other critical terms, such as "*hogar*" (household).

- Adopt a Census Bureau-wide policy to research and test data collection methodologies in languages other than English. This is under consideration.

- Develop and test standardized protocols for systematic identification and assessment of linguistic, cultural, cognitive, and methodological issues in developing questionnaires in target languages.

- Require target language questionnaires to be pretested before they are fielded to ensure they are functionally equivalent to the English instrument.

4. Recommendations on Outreach and Training

- **Expand outreach efforts and develop new outreach messages to immigrant Koreans, immigrant Latinos, and immigrants from other countries to maintain and improve coverage levels of the foreign born in the post-September 11th era, for the 2004 site test and beyond**. Mistrust of the government and fear of deportation or loss of benefits or housing leading to underreporting of persons or refusal to complete and return forms were mentioned in both our Korean and Latino immigrant studies. Kang has reported that in 2000 it was noticeably more difficult to convince Korean people in Queens to participate in interviews than it had been in 1990. Since the September 11 terrorist attacks in 2001 and subsequent crackdowns on illegal immigrants, it is likely that underreporting and nonresponse may be increasing dramatically.

- **Develop special training modules for enumerators on American Indian reservations and in Alaska Native areas that identify cultural factors that may affect the way respondents interpret and answer census and survey questions and provide instructions and procedures on how to help respondents "translate" their answers into the appropriate Census Bureau categories.**

  A special enumerator training module should be developed and tested for the Navajo on the matrilineal kinship system and how Navajo relationship terms differ from those used for the country as a whole. The differing Navajo conceptions of "household" also should be addressed. According to Blumberg (forthcoming), six of the eight largest Native American tribal groups are matrilineal. Small-scale research among the other matrilineal groups could assess whether a new training module for the Navajo matrilineal system might be adaptable to the other matrilineal groups.

  A special enumerator training module should be developed and tested for the Inupiat on the common cultural practice of grandparents formally or informally adopting their grandchildren and how enumerators should determine whether the adopted child category, or the grandchild (or other relative) category should be recorded on the form. The Inupiaq conceptions of "household" also should be addressed.

- **Plan and conduct targeted ethnographic research in other American Indian and Alaska Native tribal areas to identify cultural-specific factors that may affect the quality and comparability of data with other ethnic groups and develop enumerator training guidelines to address these factors, as part of Census 2010 research and development.**

5. **Recommendations for New Ethnographic Research Related to Coverage and Residence Rules**

- **Plan and conduct ethnographic studies of household composition, residence rules, and coverage by race/ethnic groups in conjunction with the 2004 census tests in Queens, New York.** The Queens site is of particular interest for ethnographic studies concurrent with the upcoming 2004 census site test enumeration because it is one of the most ethnically diverse counties in the country and has a high concentration of Latinos of less-studied nationalities as well as Asians. It should be noted that our Korean complex household study, done in Queens, can be of direct use in 2004 site test planning for enumeration of Koreans and other Asians. Ethnographic studies of household composition, coverage and residence rules by race/ethnic groups also could be done later in the decade, in association with other tests or as stand-alone studies.

- **Develop and conduct research to identify and assess reasons persons in different ethnic groups and of different ages might be missed in both the census and in subsequent followup coverage studies to reduce correlation bias in coverage estimates found in**

Census 2000 and the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation. The purpose would be to provide information that could help develop estimates of correlation bias for more race/ethnic groups as well as for women and children. We found evidence of underreporting of children in the Latino and Navajo studies, consistent with high 1990 undercount rates for Latino and American Indian children on reservations reported by West and Robinson (1999).

- **Conduct research on Latino naming customs and what surnames they write on census forms to: 1) assess the extent to which Latinos vary in which surname they record on the last name line and 2) identify possible effects of variation on matching and duplication and omission rates with non-Hispanics (this could be done on a bilingual Spanish-English form)**. Improvements might be made by adding more space on the last name line or making other revisions to improve the accuracy and consistency of collecting Latino names.

- **Plan and conduct new research on persons who have more than one residence and/or more than one post office box to identify factors determining where they wish to be counted and why.** Some factors identified in this study that may influence where a person with multiple residences might be counted are: 1) the inclusion in the household of family members who leave cyclically for work, even when they are gone for long periods, because they "belong here;" 2) the inclusion or exclusion of persons in transition with the intent to move in the future, who are staying only temporarily; and 3) rational calculation of gaining or maximizing benefits or minimizing losses of benefits or adverse outcomes such as deportation or the loss of housing with limits on the number of residents. A fourth factor is a concern about privacy: where they live is not the government's business.

Intentionally Blank

1. BACKGROUND[2]

> Racial and ethnic minorities are becoming a proportionately larger component of the population. In 2000, slightly more than one of ten people in the United States was foreign born. This growing cultural diversity will continue to bring new challenges to how the Census Bureau conducts its work. It will affect the methods the Census Bureau uses to collect information, the questions asked, and the presentation of data. (U. S. Census Bureau Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008: 22).

In the 1960s, two popular television shows–Ozzie and Harriet and Leave it to Beaver–reflected the normative household pattern in mainstream American society. The children were growing up in family households with both of their biological parents who were married to each other and no other person was present.

Married couples with own children under age 18 was the modal household type at that time, according to 1960 Current Population Survey (CPS) data: 44 percent of all households were of this type, while slightly over 30 percent more were comprised of married couples without children. In all, 75 percent of all U.S. households in 1960 consisted of married couples with or without children (Lugaila 1992).

---

[2] The author wishes to thank a number of colleagues for their help on the "Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Project." First, she wishes to thank Anna Y. Chan, the co-manager of the complex household project, for collaboration in planning the study, recruiting and selecting ethnographers, developing interviewing instruments, conducting ethnographer conferences, managing ethnographer contracts, and analyzing and presenting results. Anna and I thank Tommy Wright, our Statistical Research Division Chief, for his efforts to initiate the "Ethnography for the New Millennium" research program, of which this study was a part; Ruth Ann Killion, Chief of the Planning, Research, and Evaluation Division, for providing the funding; and Manuel de la Puente and Eleanor Gerber for consultations. Second, special thanks go to Martin O'Connell and Tavia Simmons of the Fertility and Family Statistics Branch of Population Division in the Census Bureau for the information they provided over the years on definitions, methods and procedures associated with collecting, processing, classifying, and analyzing data on relationships and household types across Census Bureau data collections. We appreciate the comments they provided on an earlier draft of this paper and on proposed revisions. Third, we thank our respondents as well as our ethnographers who conducted their field research and wrote their reports–Rae Blumberg, Amy Craver, Patricia Goerman, Sharon Hewner, Bernadette Holmes, with interviewing assistance from Charles Amissah, Tai Kang, and Nancy Tongue–for the rich information they provided. We wish to thank the following colleagues who reviewed earlier versions of this report and provided comments: Florence Abramson, Rae Blumberg, Leslie Brownrigg, Lorena Carrasco, Anna Y. Chan, Amy Craver, Manuel de la Puente, Eleanor Gerber, Patricia Goerman, Bernadette Holmes, Randall Neugebauer, Martin O'Connell, Diane Schmidley, Kevin A. Shaw, Tavia Simmons, and Nancy Tongue. Finally, the author extends heartfelt thanks to Barbara Palumbo who spent countless hours formatting and making corrections to successive drafts of this report. Her patience and attention to detail are greatly appreciated.

Since 1960, household structure in the United States has changed dramatically. By 2000, CPS data show that the household type of married couples with children under 18 comprised just 24 percent of the total number of households, falling behind married couples without children (just under 29 percent) and persons living alone (25.5 percent). In all, just under 53 percent of households in 2000 consisted of married couples with or without children, according to the CPS (Fields and Casper 2001).

The Ozzie and Harriet type of family is no longer typical of mainstream society. A question can be raised as to whether this type of family was representative of the modal household structure in some non-white ethnic subpopulations in this country in the 1960s or during other time periods.

Household structure has been diversifying in this country as a result of demographic trends such as: increases in immigration rates and the proportion of the population that is foreign born (as shown in the quote from the Census Bureau's strategic plan, quoted above), and changing migration streams now coming predominantly from Asia and Latin America, rather than from Europe. Other factors include increases in cohabitation and blended families due to more divorces and remarriages; increases in the proportions of cohabitor households with children; and dramatic increases in grandparent-maintained households and nonrelative households.

This overall project report identifies and describes the results of small-scale exploratory ethnographic research on complex households in selected ethnic groups in the United States included in five of the seven Office of Management and Budget's official race/ethnic categories: African Americans, American Indians and/or Alaska Natives, Hispanic/Latinos, Asians, and U.S. born non-Hispanic whites.[3] We were not able to include studies of the two other official race groups–Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders–due to the lack of availability of expert ethnographers on these groups in the spring of 2000 when the research was conducted.

This exploratory ethnographic research project has three aims. The first is to explore the range and functioning of complex households within different ethnic groups, and the second is to examine how the response categories of the decennial relationship question capture the emerging diversity of household types in the United States. The third aim has three components: a) to assess how well census methods, questions, relationship categories and household composition typologies describe the emerging diversity of household types, b) to suggest revisions to the relationship question and response categories for the 2010 census, and c) to call for new research to increase our understanding of this increasing diversity and to develop improved methods and questions to reflect it in future data collections.

---

[3] The specific ethnic groups in this study were African Americans, Navajos, Inupiaq Eskimos, Latino immigrants, Korean immigrants, and rural non-Hispanic whites. See Table 4 for more information on these studies.

1.1 Research on Complex Households

The category of "complex households" is not an official Census Bureau household type. It is a category developed by researchers in the Census Bureau to refer to households that differ from the norm in terms of the types of relatives and/or nonrelatives living there and to those with living situations that may make accurate enumeration of them difficult. For this project, the authors of this report developed a general working definition of complex households:

> Complex households are those where the web of relationships within the household is other than one nuclear family (i.e., nuclear family being married couples with or without their own biological children) that may be difficult to describe using census categories based on the single nuclear family model. Complex households may have relatives that do not fit into the typical Census Bureau response categories of parent, spouse, biological child, or biological sibling. Examples include, but are not limited to: nonrelatives; unmarried partners; gay partners; more distant kin such as grandparents, cousins, uncles, etc.; classificatory kin; fictive kin; children or others who are shared across households; people who may be mobile or ambiguous in terms of household membership; etc. Households that have one nuclear family plus any other person or persons, including those who made up two nuclear families, also may be complex households.

Complex households were ranked as the first of eleven barriers to full enumeration in the census in the early 1990s (Year 2000 Research and Development Staff 1992) and continue to be viewed as important for planning for the 2010 census (2010 Planning Staff, Planning, Research, and Evaluation Division 1999). Complex and/or irregular households were mentioned as a cause of errors in the 1990 Census in nearly all of the 29 ethnographic coverage reports, particularly those on recent immigrants.[4] Irregular and/or complex households in the sites often had unrelated persons, mobile and/or ambiguous members, households formed solely to share rent and/or households comprised of two or more families (de la Puente 1993). A related cause of errors was cultural conceptions of household and family at variance with census residence rules in immigrant and black study sites (Martin and de la Puente 1993). Respondents with differing cultural assumptions about household structure may be more likely to misunderstand roster questions and omit persons (Hainer et al. 1988). A correspondence has been noted between the increasing trend in unusual living situations and rises in census undercoverage in a household population segment (Shapiro, Diffendal, and Cantor 1993).

The Living Situation Survey, which oversampled for minorities and renters with a nationally representative sample, had among its objectives: 1) increased rostering of types of persons known to be missed in censuses and surveys; and identification of 2) a wide range of actual living situations of persons, and 3) changes in household composition and residence patterns (Schwede 1993). Sweet and Alberti (1994) found that about nine percent of persons in the Living Situation Survey had complex living situations that may be prone to misreporting by household respondents.

---

[4] A list of the ethnographic reports done in conjunction with the 1990 Census as part of the Ethnographic Evaluation of the Behavioral Causes of Census Undercount Project is included in Appendix C.

Work has been done on cultural assumptions influencing household membership decisions among low-income blacks (Gerber 1990) and how respondents determine residency status of complex, irregular living situations (Gerber 1994; Gerber and Bates 1994). Other research focused on behavior patterns of persons who may be omitted from rosters: mobility patterns revealed by the Living Situation Survey (Bates and Gerber 1994); discontinuous residence (Martin 1996); and on subjective and objective assessments of household membership (Schwede and Ellis 1994). One study identifies types of respondents who make errors in rostering complex and irregular households (Schwede 1993).

1.2 Demographic Trends and Complex Households

Complex households are a subcategory of the broader topic of household composition. Household composition is very likely to be undergoing increased diversification in tandem with several other population trends documented in Census Bureau reports.

1.2.1 Increasing Immigration Rates and Changing Characteristics of the Foreign Born

First, increasing immigration rates and changes in migration streams primarily from Latin America and Asia may be expected to lead to increasing diversification of household composition types. Recent estimates (Hollman, Mulder, and Kallan 2000) indicate that the growth in the foreign born population from 1990 through the decade was almost four times that of the native population. Foreign born Hispanics, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and African Americans increased by 34-42 percent.

According to the Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2000 (Schmidley 2001) using CPS data, the foreign-born population numbered 9.6 million in 1970. By 2000 it had grown to 28.4 million (10.4 percent). A newly released report using March 2002 CPS data shows further growth to 32.5 million (11.5 percent of the civilian noninstitutionalized population in the United States) foreign born persons (Schmidley 2003).

Migration streams have changed dramatically, from primarily Europeans in the past to Latin Americans and Asians in recent years: in 2002, 52.2 percent of the foreign born in this country were from Latin America and 25.5 percent were from Asia (Schmidley 2003). Data from the March 2000 CPS show that, on average, families of foreign-born householders were larger than those of native householders (3.72 to 3.1) and had larger numbers of adults (2.47 to 2.15) and of children (1.25 to 0.94) (U.S. Census Bureau: December 2001: 4). The 2002 March CPS data show that foreign born households are twice as likely as native born households to have five or more persons in their family households (Schmidley 2003).

The larger number of adults in foreign born households, the overall size of these households, and the much higher incidence of foreign born family households with five or more persons strongly suggest that many of these foreign born households may be complex. Foreign-born immigrants

from non-European areas may be more likely to form non-traditional, complex households consistent with cultural values in their home countries than to adopt the nuclear family household model more common in the United States. Additionally, some people who lived in nuclear households in their own country might form complex households in this country for economic reasons: to share the high costs of rent. A primary reason for the formation of complex households among the Korean immigrants in this study was economic: people living together in order to share the high cost of rent in Queens, New York.

These trends in rising immigration and those in differential birth rates are expected to lead to dramatic changes in the relative proportions of minority to white subpopulations. In the 1990s, Census Bureau population projections indicated that differential subpopulation growth of minorities and whites over the decades would result in non-Latino whites comprising less than 50 percent of the U.S. population sometime during the decade of the 2050s. With the unexpectedly high numbers of Latinos counted in Census 2000, there is a possibility that future estimates of growth rates based on Census 2000 data might project this changeover to majority minority status to occur earlier than 2050, but these projections have not yet been done (Hollman, personal communication 2003). Differential growth rates of subpopulations may lead to increases in the number and variety of complex households.

1.2.2. Large Increases in the Prevalence of Cohabiting Unmarried Partners

Second, there has been a remarkable increase in the prevalence of cohabiting unmarried partners, according to Bumpass and Liu (1998). According to Casper and Bianchi (2002) less than one percent of all households had unmarried partners in 1970. By 1980 the proportion had more than doubled and by 1990 it reached 3.5 percent. In 2000 cohabitation had increased to 3.7 percent of all households (Fields and Casper 2001).

1.2.3. Large Increases in the Proportion of Cohabitor Households with Children

Third, as the proportion of cohabitor households increased, the proportion of these cohabitor households with children also increased. In 1978, 28 percent of cohabiting households had children under 18 (Casper and Bianchi 2002) and by 2000, 41percent had children in that age range (Fields and Casper 2001). These comparative figures come from Current Population Survey data at different time periods.

According to a just-released report on “coupled households” using Census 2000 data, there were 5.5 million unmarried partner households. Eight of nine of these were unmarried partner couple households of the opposite sex while the remainder were of the same sex (Simmons and O’Connell 2003).

1.2.4. Increases in Remarriages and Blended Married and Unmarried Couple Households

Fourth, increases in remarriages, some of which lead to blended families with children from one or both sides, have led to diversification of household types. The remarriage rate hit a high of about 40 percent in 1980 and declined somewhat to about 36 percent in 1990, according to Current Population Survey data (Casper and Bianchi 2002). This is still a substantial proportion of families with the potential to have coresident steprelatives.

Using Census 2000 data, Simmons and O'Connell (2003) attempted to capture the presence of partner's children in unmarried partner households who might otherwise not be included in the statistics because of masking caused by asking relationship to Person One only. They estimated that 43 percent of households with partners of the opposite sex had own and/or unrelated children under 18. They also reported that among same-sex cohabiting partners, 33 percent of female same-sex householders coresided with their sons and daughters under 18, while 22 percent of the male same-sex householders had their own children in the household.

1.2.5 Dramatic Increases in Grandparent-maintained Families

Fifth, there have also been dramatic increases in grandparent maintained-families. From 1990 to 1997, grandparent maintained households increased by 19%, with the most growth occurring among grandparent maintained households with neither parent of the grandchild present (Casper and Bryson 1998).

These demographic trends–increasing immigration rates and changing migration streams, increases in the prevalence of cohabiting unmarried partners with and without children, increases in blended married and unmarried couple households, and increases in grandparent-maintained families–may be contributing to increasing complexity of household types.

How are household types portrayed in Census data products? Before we can answer this question we need to discuss the key variable used in constructing household types: the relationship question.

1.3 The Relationship Question

"Relationship" is one of the most basic demographic variables. It is collected in virtually all censuses and demographic surveys. It is one of just five demographic variables that are known as "100 percent items" because they are collected from every household on both the short and long census forms during decennial censuses. In most censuses and surveys, relationships are collected by asking how each person in the household is related to Person One.

1.3.1 The Census 2000 Relationship Question

The Census 2000 relationship question that respondents answered in this study of complex households is shown here.2. How is this person related to Person 1? *Mark [X] ONE box.*

- ☐ Husband/wife
- ☐ Natural-born son/daughter
- ☐ Adopted son/daughter
- ☐ Stepson/stepdaughter
- ☐ Brother/sister
- ☐ Father/mother
- ☐ Grandchild
- ☐ Parent-in-law
- ☐ Son-in-law/daughter-in-law
- ☐ Other relative - *Print exact relationship* ➚
- ☐ Roomer, boarder
- ☐ Housemate, roommate
- ☐ Unmarried partner
- ☐ Foster child
- ☐ Other nonrelative

1.3.2 Purpose of the Relationship Question on the Census Form

The purpose for including the relationship question on census forms is to "observe the changing composition of families and households in the United States" (Simmons and O'Neill 2001). "Relationship" is a fundamental component in the development of "Household Type:" the household composition variable in Census Bureau reports and data products, which will be discussed in more detail below. According to Simmons and O'Neill (2001: 8), relationship data are also used 1) to determine how money is allocated in federally funded nutrition and education programs; 2) to handle some Social Security planning issues; 3) in implementing the poverty definition and allocating funds for many federal programs; and 4) to identify areas experiencing changes in the number of a) children, b) elderly parents living with a householder, c) single-parent households and d) grandparent-maintained households so agencies can develop and evaluate programs to help these populations. Researchers, policy makers, and businesses also use relationship data.

1.3.3 The Number and Specificity of Relationship Categories have Increased in Every Census since 1970

The relationship categories used by the Census Bureau reflect the relationships in our society deemed most important to delineate at the time of each census and our norms for households composition. These categories express relationships based on kinship and marriage, cohabitation, and on economic (e.g., housemate/roommate) and/or legal ties (e.g. adopted child, foster child). Before 1970, there were no specific response categories; the interviewer asked the respondent for the relationships to the household head and wrote down whatever the respondent said. Table 1 shows the relationship categories used in decennial censuses from 1970 to 2000.

The 1970 census ushered in the use of specific response categories for relationships. Important relationship categories, such as son/daughter or wife, were listed as separate printed response categories with check boxes and respondents were asked to mark the appropriate box.

In the 1970 census the terms for kinship and marriage reflected the ideal household type at that time: the nuclear family. There were just three specified categories for marriage and kinship (household head, wife of head, and son/daughter of head) and two for nonrelatives (roomer/boarder/lodger, and inmate/patient).[5] General catchall categories of "other relative" and "other nonrelative" had a check box for relationships deemed less important, with associated write-in lines where respondents could record exact relationship.

Since the 1970 census, every subsequent decennial census has had an increase in the number of relationships that were deemed important enough to delineate specifically with their own stand-alone response categories. This is especially the case for kinship and marriage terms.

In 1980, the term "head of household" was dropped from the census and other Census Bureau surveys and a category for husband/wife was placed in the relationship question for the spouse of the "householder."[6] New categories for brother/sister and father/mother were added. These represent a widening of nuclear family arrangements. A nonrelated category was added for "partner/roommate" which seems to have been the first attempt to learn about unrelated unmarried persons who were living together as couples.

In 1990, several new response categories were added to the relationship question to reflect nuclear families augmented by adoption (added to the category for natural-born child), and remarriages (stepchildren), and simple lineally extended living arrangements (grandchild). Partner was changed to unmarried partner and made a stand-alone category because of increases in cohabitation rates while housemate was added to the roommate category.

---

[5] For a discussion of changes in Census Bureau categories and definitions for households, relations in households, and family types up to and including the 1990 Census, see Brownrigg (1991). For changes between 1990 and 2000, see Simmons and O'Neill (2001).

[6] The Census Bureau adopted the term "householder" around the time of the 1980 census. The term, "head of household," is no longer used in decennial census and CPS data products.

Table 1. Relationship Categories used in the 1970, 1980, 1990 Censuses and in Census 2000

	1970 Census	1980 Census	1990 Census	Census 2000
RELATIVES				
Household head (male)	x			
Wife of head	x			
Husband/Wife		x	x	x
Son/Daughter[1]	x	x	y	y
Natural-born or adopted son/daughter			x	y
Natural-born son/daughter				x
Adopted son/daughter				x
Stepson/stepdaughter			x	x
Brother/Sister		x	x	x
Father/mother		x	x	x
Grandchild			x	x
Parent-in-law				x
Son or daughter-in-law				x
Other relative[1] box & write-in	x	x	x	x
NONRELATIVES				
Roomer/boarder/lodger	x			
Inmate/patient	x			
Paid employee		x		
Roomer/boarder, foster child			x	
Roomer/boarder		x		x
Foster child				x
Housemate/roommate			x	x
Partner/roommate		x		
Unmarried partner			x	x
Other nonrelative[1] : write-in	x	x		
Other nonrelative: no write-in			x	x
Total N of categories on form	**7**	**9**	**11**	**15**

x Category is specified on the form y Summary count possible by adding subcategory counts
[1] Relationship was asked to "household head" in 1970, but to Person One from 1980 on.

In Census 2000, a number of additions were made to further delineate children and in-laws: adopted son/daughter was given its own category separate from natural-born son/daughter and foster child appears as a stand-alone nonrelative category for the first time. Parent-in-law and son-in-law/daughter-in-law appear for the first time.

These new categories in Census 2000 reflect the augmented nuclear family as well as the nuclear family expanded to a stovepipe extended family: parent or parent-in-law, respondent, adult son/daughter or adult son-in-law/daughter-in-law, and grandchildren. The addition of these categories enabled Population Division analysts to write the first report on multi-generational households (Simmons and O'Neill 2001).

Thus the clear trend in every decennial census since 1970 has been to add new relationship categories and revise existing ones to reflect ongoing changes in the population of the United States. The number of relationship categories increased from 7 in 1970 to 15 in Census 2000.

There is compelling evidence from two different sources that some additional categories need to be added for the 2010 census to reflect growing household complexity: nephew/niece, brother-in-law/sister-in-law, uncle/aunt, cousin, and grandparent.

The first source of evidence that these lateral relationship terms should be added to the 2010 census relationship question is the ethnographic data on complex households in the six ethnic groups included in this report. Alternative household composition patterns based on wider relations with kin have been the norm among the Navajo and Inupiat,[7] as well as Latino immigrants and others included in this study, as well as other ethnic groups not included here, due to differing cultural norms on kinship and household composition, mobility patterns, and economic and other factors. For example, Navajo households are very fluid and their conceptions of "household" are based more on social interdependence and interaction than shared physical structure. Inupiaq Eskimo grandparents frequently adopt their grandchildren, either formally or informally and raise them while their parents are mobile. Latino immigrants may live with their adult siblings, brothers-in-law, sisters-in-law, nieces, nephews, and godchildren. Section 4 of this report will present a full discussion of the variety of complex households in the six ethnic study groups, as well as the factors that lead to their formation.

The second source of evidence is an analysis of write-ins for the "other relative" category in Census 2000. Table 2 shows that more than half of the write-ins to the relationship question are for these categories: nephews/nieces, brothers-in-law/sisters-in-law, cousins, uncles/aunts, and lineal extended kin, such as grandparents.

---

[7] The spelling of the name of this Eskimo group changes, depending on whether the name is used as an adjective or a noun. When used as a noun for the ethnic group, the proper spelling is "Inupiat." When used as an adjective, the proper spelling is "Inupiaq," as in Inupiaq Eskimos.

Table 2. Breakdowns of the "Other Relative" Write-Ins on the Relationship Question in Census 2000

Write-ins on the "Other relative" line	% of all Write-ins N=5,098,766
Laterally extended kin	**51.4**
Nephews/nieces	26.1
Brother-in-law/sister-in-law	12.3
Cousin	9.1
Uncle/Aunt	3.9
Grandparent	**1.8**
Duplicates of specified categories (e.g. husband/wife)	**31.9**
Unspecified: "Other relative" and "Other nonrelative"	**15.4**
Total	**100.5****

* Data from Census 2000 provided by Tavia Simmons (Population Division)
** Greater than 100 percent due to rounding.

However, not all respondents take the time and effort to write in one of these specific relationships when they can just mark the "other relative" checkbox and move on to the next question. We do not know whether the distribution of write-in relationships we actually received in Census 2000 is representative of the distribution of relationships among those who chose not to write in specific relationships. As a result of not having stand-alone response categories on the Census 2000 form for nephew/niece, uncle/aunt, cousin, grandparent, and brother-in-law/sister-in-law, we cannot give reliable estimates of the proportion of multigenerational households that are laterally extended. We join Martin O'Connell in Population Division in advocating that these categories be added to the census form for 2010.

1.3.4 The Relationship Question and Categories Differ among Censuses, the ACS and the CPS, with Census 2000 Collecting the Most Information

The Census Bureau uses several different approaches for collecting relationship data in decennial censuses and in large demographic surveys such as the new American Community Survey (ACS), the Current Population Survey (CPS)[8] and the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). The approaches differ in terms of 1) their ability to detect interrelationships within the household and 2) the precision of the relationship categories collected.

1.3.4.1 First, the census, ACS, CPS, and SIPP differ in their ability to detect interrelationships within households.

- The census short form and ACS forms ask only one basic relationship question: "How is this person related to (Person One)?" (The long census form which goes to about 16 percent of the population includes some questions for households in which grandparents are raising grandchildren).

- The CPS asks the same basic relationship question above as well as additional relationship questions to identify one coresident parent for each child in the house and to identify a spouse of another adult in the house. The problem with collecting relationships to Person One alone is that relationships among other persons in the household may not be identified. This problem of masking is an issue that will be addressed in the results section.

- The Survey of Income and Program Participation Topical Module 2 is the gold standard for collecting data on relationships within households. The respondent provides relationship of each person to Person One, as is the case with the census, the ACS, and the CPS, but then goes on to collect the relationship of each person to every other person in the household. This method solves the problem of masked relationships due to asking for relationship only to Person One. The SIPP relationship data enable the most precise household types to be delineated.

1.3.4.2 Second, the 1990 and 2000 censuses, the CPS and ACS differ in the precision of the relationship categories collected.

Table 3 compares the relationship categories on the 1990 and 2000 censuses from Table 1 to those in the CPS and the ACS.

---

[8] Most Census Bureau reports on household composition and living arrangements are based on data from the Current Population Survey March Supplement. For many years, the Census Bureau produced annual reports and data in the two series, "Household and Family Characteristics" and "Marital Status and Living Arrangements." Beginning with the March 2000 Current Population Survey, these reports have been combined into one new series, "America's Families and Living Arrangements (Fields and Casper 2001). Data users should be aware that distributions of household composition may differ between the census and the CPS because of different data collection methods and because of different residence rules. For example, the CPS household includes college students living away at college while the census does not. As a result, the number of adult children recorded as living at home will be higher when using data from the CPS than from census data.

The primary differences among the four data collections revolve around the number of specific response categories for children and in-laws, as well as whether the other relative category has a write-in line or not.

Other relative write-in line: While all four questionnaires include a catchall "other relative" line, only the 1990 and 2000 census questions provide a write-in line for exact relationship. Respondents are given the opportunity to write in a relationship category that is not printed on the form. The ACS and the CPS do not allow a write-in; with ACS data, the only relationships that can be identified are those specified in stand-alone response categories. What relationships you see in Table 3 for the ACS relationship question are all that you can get in the analysis of relationships.

Children: Earlier we noted the increasing differentiation in categories for children in the decennial censuses. The 1980 census just included the general category for son/daughter; the 1990 census split out stepchildren from natural-born/adopted children, and Census 2000 went the final step of distinguishing natural-born children from adopted children. In contrast, the CPS, which has been conducted over more than 50 years, has just one generic relative category: "child." The ACS, which was developed and fielded in the mid-1990s, goes back to the generic 1980 census single category–son/daughter–rather than the 1990 or 2000 census versions that provide more differentiation of children. Lacking a write-in line, analysts using the ACS data will have no way to differentiate stepchildren from adopted children from natural-born children, as they can with Census 2000 data.

In-laws: As we saw earlier, Census 2000 was the first census to have stand-alone categories for two types of in-laws: parents-in-law and sons-in-law/daughters-in-law. In 1990, respondents had the opportunity to identify in-laws on the write-in line. In the CPS, in-laws are included in the miscellaneous "other relative" category and can't be disaggregated. The ACS form is better than the 1990 form and the CPS form in having a stand-alone category for in-law, but it doesn't distinguish parent-in-law from son-in-law/daughter-in-law as Census 2000 does. Therefore, the ACS doesn't provide the kind of information needed to ascertain the generational depth of households with in-laws that is provided with Census 2000 data.

Generic terms: It is interesting to note that the CPS uses the unisex generic terms of "spouse," "child," and "parent" in the question and on the flashcard. All of the census forms since at least 1970 have used "husband/wife," "son/daughter," and "father/mother." Do respondents interpret "spouse" to mean the same thing as "husband/wife?" This would be interesting to explore in a qualitative study of relationship terms. In this case, the ACS follows the census pattern.

By differentiating types of children and in-laws, the Census 2000 questionnaire provided the most precise data on relationships of persons related to the householder, distinguishing: spouse, natural-born child, adopted child, stepchild, sibling, parent, parent-in-law, child-in-law and allowing a write-in answer for "other relative." By including a write-in line for other relative, new categories that are growing in size–nephew/niece, uncle/aunt, cousin, brother-in-law/sister-in-law and grandparent–can be identified and their numbers tabulated. The write-in line thus helps to identify potential categories for addition to the next census relationship question.

Table 3. Comparison of relationship categories included in the 1990 Census, Census 2000, the American Community Survey, and the Current Population Survey

Relationship categories	Census or Survey			
	Current Population Survey	1990 Census	Census 2000	American Community Survey
RELATIVES				
Spouse or Husband/Wife	x	x	x	x
Child or Son/Daughter	x	y	y	x
Natural-born or adopted son/daughter		x		
Natural-born son/daughter			x	
Adopted son/daughter			x	
Stepson/stepdaughter		x	x	
Brother/Sister	x	x	x	x
Parent or Father/mother	x	x	x	x
Grandchild	x	x	x	x
Other relative check box	x	x	x	x
In-law			y	x
Parent-in-law			x	
Son or daughter-in-law			x	
Other relative			x	
Other relative check box with write-in line		x	x	
NONRELATIVES				
Roomer/boarder, foster child		x		
Roomer/boarder	x		x	x
Foster child	x		x	x
Housemate/roommate	x	x	x	x
Unmarried partner	x	x	x	x
Other nonrelative: no write-in	x	x	x	x
Total number of relationship categories on form	11	11	15	12

x This relationship category is specified on the form
y This summary category count can be obtained by adding the subcategory counts

1.3.5 Why Relationship Questions Vary over Time and Data Collections

Schwede asked Census Bureau experts why the number and precision of relationship categories has varied across our censuses and surveys. Martin O'Connell, chief of the Population Division Fertility and Family Statistics Branch, said that additional response categories have been added to censuses over time as a result of the types of information requested by outside stakeholders and data users. When asked why the new ACS questionnaire had fewer relationship categories for children and in-laws, and the "other relative" write-in option had been removed, Martin O'Connell said it was because of space limitations on the demographic grid in the ACS questionnaire. One of the designers of the American Community Survey grid said that conserving space on the grid and keeping the overall length of the ACS questionnaire as short as possible were part of the reason. The other factor, according to this designer, was that a statistical analysis of write-in responses showed that 1) the majority of categories written in were for relationships specifically identified in separate categories, such as spouse or child and hence were redundant, and 2) coding of the remaining write-ins would be too time-consuming. Our analysis of the write-ins from more recent Census 2000 data showed a somewhat different pattern in Table 2, with a majority of the write-ins being for more distant kin categories, but there were still many redundant answers, and the recoding of the write-ins did take more than a person-year of effort. The addition of these more distant kin categories as stand-alone categories in 2010 would reduce the time and associated costs of recoding large numbers of write-in responses.

1.36 Changes to the Relationship Question Need Pretesting

We have been unable to find past evidence that alternative versions of relationship questions and/or the number and precision of response categories have been cognitively tested for the census. There has been some cognitive pretesting of the relationship questions for the Survey of Income and Program Participation. Not knowing of any previous split-panel test of alternative versions of the relationship question, we suggested in mid-2002 that the Census Bureau consider planning a split-panel test of three alternative relationship questions: the Census 2000 question, the ACS question, and a new question based on the recommendations in this report. The idea was received very favorably. We have been told that such a split-panel test with our categories, as well as a few other changes, has been incorporated into the objectives of the 2005 Content Test.

1.4 Household type

"Household type" is the Census Bureau's primary variable for household composition. It is generated using the relationship question, specifically, relationship to Person One. Household type" is one of the central variables the Census Bureau has been tracking annually for more than a half century in the "Household and Family Characteristics" report series, which, as noted earlier, has recently been expanded and renamed as the "America's Families and Living

Arrangements" series (Fields and Casper 2001). The relationship question shown on page 7 is a critical variable in the construction of household type, which will be discussed in more detail below.

1.4.1 Basic Census Bureau Household Types

The Census Bureau distinguishes two general types of households: family households and non-family households. Family households are comprised of two or more coresident persons, at least one of whom is related to Person One (a householder) by birth, marriage or adoption. Family households are subdivided into three categories on the basis of answers to the relationship question and sex: married couple family, female householder family with no husband present, and male householder family with no wife present. Other persons not related to the householder may also be part of the family household, but their presence/absence does not change the classification of the household.

Non-family households can consist of one or more persons: 1) one householder living alone or 2) a householder living with one or more persons, all of whom are unrelated to the householder (though some of them may be related to each other). Nonfamily households are subdivided into two categories based on the sex of Person One: female householder non-family household and male householder non-family household.

These five categories--married couple family, female householder family, male householder family, along with female householder non-family and male householder nonfamily–are the basic household types most often provided in Census Bureau data products and reports. Additional breakdowns may be made on the basis of person living alone/person living with other nonrelated persons, presence/absence of children, presence/absence of subfamilies, presence/absence of nonrelatives, size of household, and other factors.

1.4.2 A New Household Type: Multigenerational Households

A new household type, multigenerational households, has become available for the first time. Expansion of the relationship categories to include grandchildren (in 1990) and parent-in-law and child-in-law (in 2000) enabled Population Division demographers Tavia Simmons and Grace O'Neill to tabulate and publish data on multigenerational families comprised of 1) householder-child-grandchild, 2) parent/parent-in-law of householder, householder, and child and 3) parent/parent-in-law of householder-householder-child-grandchild. These three "stovepipe" types of extended households are a subset of multigenerational households because they reflect direct lineal kin.

1.4.3 Limitations of the New Household Type: Multigenerational Households

It is not yet possible to reliably delineate multigenerational and/or extended families that have laterally related kin, such as aunts/uncles, nieces/nephews, cousins, or more distant relatives. As noted earlier, Census 2000 did allow write-in answers and these categories were given separate codes. However, the write-in was optional; some respondents did write in exact relationships, but others did not; this variation may or may not be random. We cannot assume that those who did not write in relationships would have the same final distribution of other relatives as those who did write in relationships. As long as these categories for collateral kin continue to remain undifferentiated in the "other relative" category, it is not possible to delineate complex multigenerational households that are laterally extended without concerns of reliability.

Many of the complex households included in this study include these more distant kin; they cannot be fully described with the current household types available for census data and reports.

1.4.4 Relationship Categories are Used to Construct the Household Type Variable Distinguishing Married Couple Households from Other Family Households

The classification of household type into the five standard categories–married couple family, female householder family and male householder family or female householder or male householder nonfamily–is made on the basis of the answers to the relationship question, such as "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner." There is no question on the Census 2000 short form for marital status, although this question does appear on the long form.

We have not yet done studies to double check how reliably the designation of "husband/wife" or "unmarried partner" in the relationship question indicate whether couples are truly married or not, either formally or through the common law mechanism. It might be possible to look into this by using some statistical technique with an unedited Census 2000 long form data file to determine the correlation between marking "married" in the marital status question and marking "husband/wife" in the relationship question. We understand this could be done at the state level with existing data files, but that new national-level data files would be needed to analyze this for the country as a whole.

Results from this ethnographic research on complex households among six race/ethnic groups presented later in this report show there is variation in respondents' interpretation of what the "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" categories mean.

2. METHODS

2.1 Selection of Ethnographers and Ethnic Groups for this Study

In late 1999, we sent out a request for proposals for six small-scale ethnographic studies of complex households among different race/ethnic groups. These studies would be conducted during the latter phase of Census 2000 data collection. We sought experienced ethnographers who had recently been immersed in study of an ethnic community to return to the same field site personally to conduct semi-structured ethnographic research on complex households for us. These ethnographers had already forged ties with community leaders and gained acceptance in the ethnic community and would be familiar with the range of complex households there.

Our aim was to sponsor ethnographic studies of complex households in all six of race groups recognized by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB 1997) for federal data collections–African Americans, American Indian/Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, Other Pacific Islanders, and Whites–as well as those of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.[9] We received more than 80 proposals and were able to select experienced ethnographers covering all groups except Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders. We squeezed our budget to fund two studies in the American Indian/Alaska Native group–Navajos and Inupiaq Eskimo–to explore similarities and differences between them. Table 4 shows the names of the ethnographers, the specific ethnic groups included in the study and the locations of research.

[9] According to the Office of Management and Budget, Hispanic/Latino is not considered to be a race; it is considered to be an "ethnicity."

Table 4. The Six Ethnographic Studies: Race/Ethnic Groups, Ethnographers, and Research Sites

OMB Race/ethnic group	Specific Ethnic Group	Ethnographer	Location
White	Rural Whites	Sharon Hewner	Western New York State
African American	African Americans	Bernadette Holmes,* Charles Amissah	Southeastern Virginia
American Indian	Navajo	Nancy Tongue	Navajo reservation
Alaska Native	Inupiat	Amy Craver	Rural Alaska
Asian	Immigrant Koreans	Tai Kang	Queens, New York
Hispanic/Latino	Latino immigrants primarily from Central America	Rae Blumberg, Patricia Goerman	Central Virginia

* The Holmes/Amissah study was conducted in 2002.

2.2 The First Ethnographic Conference

In March, 2000 we convened a conference of the ethnographers at Census Bureau headquarters in Suitland, Maryland. After they were sworn to protect confidentiality under the provisions of Title 13, we gave them an overview of our complex household project, discussed the semi-structured protocol and other materials we would be developing for use in all of the sites, and encouraged open discussion on the topic of complex households among different race/ethnic groups.

One of the key issues discussed at this first conference concerned the definition of "household" to be used in this study. We wanted to assess the degree of fit between the Census Bureau's official definition of "household" and the definitions of "household" held by respondents in different ethnic groups. The official definition of "household" for Census 2000:

> A household includes all of the people who occupy a housing unit. A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room occupied (or if vacant, intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other people in the building and that have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall. The

> occupants may be a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any other group of related or unrelated people who share living quarters.
>
> In 100 percent tabulations, the count of households or householders always equals the count of occupied housing units. In sample tabulations, the numbers may differ as a result of the weighting process. (U. S. Census Bureau, Census 2000: Technical Documentation, B-9.)

"Household" is thus officially defined by the Census Bureau in terms of coresidence within a physically defined structure at a specific location. The "housing unit" (and, by extension, the household) is the basic statistical unit for enumerating respondents and their coresidents in the household universe.[10] Housing units are identified by addresses, not names, on the frame (the Master Address File). The frame is updated through the collection of address lists and through field listing operations prior to decennial censuses. Census forms are mailed to city style addresses but may be delivered to rural style addresses. If a form is not returned within a specified time period, interviewers try to reach the household by phone or personal visit during the Nonresponse Followup Operation. Households in some areas, such as American Indian/Alaska Native reservations, are always enumerated by interviewers in the census. In Census 2000, the Navajo reservation and Inupiaq communities in this study were enumerated by interviewers while the rural whites, African Americans, Koreans, and Latinos were included in the mailback operation. Census forms in Spanish and Korean (and other languages) were used.

The purpose of the census is to count everyone in the country once in the place where he/she lives most of the time so that congressional representation and federal funding can be allocated fairly. From an operational standpoint, defining households and the persons in them in terms of addresses of physically defined permanent structures is more efficient than trying to define households by names of inhabitant, since individuals and social households may move.

In our preliminary conference, the ethnographers pointed out that "households" are social units made up of persons who share domestic functions such as cooking and eating together, doing housework, providing child care, and/or sharing expenses that may not coincide with one housing

---

[10] The other basic statistical unit for enumeration is the "group quarter," used to enumerate all non-housing unit locations. Group quarters include such places as college dorms, nursing homes, correctional facilities, and outdoor locations where homeless people congregate. For a complete list of group quarters types used in Census 2000, see U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Technical Documentation, pp. B-3 to B-8. Group quarters account for less than five percent of the total population during censuses. They were not included in this study.

unit.[11] In mainstream America, the predominant pattern is that persons within the same housing unit share the domestic functions; there is no discrepancy in members between the physical household and the social household. However, this may not be the predominant pattern among other ethnic groups or other subcultures where those who share domestic functions may live in different housing units.

The ethnographers point out that data from censuses and surveys which have the physical household as the unit of analysis will not provide the kind of data they seek on "social households" in subcultures where households are defined by members of that culture in terms of shared interaction, rather than coresidence in one housing unit. Researchers who wish to study "social households" not constrained by physical dwellings should be aware of these definitional differences and will need to design their own special household selection methods to achieve their objectives.

Data users of Census Bureau censuses and surveys should be aware that "households" (defined as all people living within one housing unit) and persons are the units of analysis in Census Bureau data products.

2.3 Selection of Respondents in the Six Study Sites

We decided that the best way to learn about the range of complex households in different ethnic groups was to allow each of the ethnographers to use his/her own expert knowledge of the ethnic community to select culturally appropriate types of complex households for this study. After the first conference, the ethnographers began finding local community leaders to help them identify complex households for potential interviews. Nancy Tongue hired a Navajo man as a cultural liaison to help her to identify, find, and interview Navajo respondents, in English or in the Navajo language. Amy Craver went to Inupiaq tribal officials to get permission to conduct interviews and hired an Inupiaq community leader to help identify appropriate households. Kang hired well-known Korean community leaders to help him identify appropriate households and to accompany him during interviews. Even with the assistance of these community leaders and being Korean himself, he had a very difficult time finding respondents willing to be interviewed.

---

[11] Schwede was well aware of the conceptual differences between "physical households" and "social households" when she first proposed this ethnographic study of complex ethnic households in 1999; she had explored this issue as part of her research on households in West Sumatra, Indonesia (Schwede 1991) and was quite interested in seeing how this duality played out in these studies. This has been a topic of discussion in anthropology for many years. See, for example Yanagisako's literature review on families and households in the Annual Review of Anthropology (1979), the seminal book on households by Netting, Wilk, and Arnould (1984), as well as Brownrigg's 1991 paper on Census Bureau definitions of the household. See also Wallerstein and Smith (1991).

Sharon Hewner enlisted the help of local community leaders to identify complex households in her area and then used snowball sampling to identify additional respondents. Bernadette Holmes and Charles Amissah requested the assistance of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and other community leaders and respondents to identify appropriate households for interviewing. Patricia Goerman and Rae Blumberg attended local churches frequented by immigrant Latinos to identify complex households. Goerman also worked with community leaders and used snowball sampling for recruiting

2.4 Development of the Interview Protocol and Other Materials

While the ethnographers were developing their lists of complex households for potential interviews, the authors developed a standardized, semi-structured protocol, sent it out for review and pretesting by the ethnographers, and finalized it (the final questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix B). We also developed two grid forms for the ethnographers to complete during the interviews: one to collect demographic data and the other to collect all interrelationships within the household. The relationship grid was modeled on the relationship grid used in the Wave 2 Topical Module of the Census Bureau's Survey of Income and Program Participation.

A mix of cognitive and ethnographic interviewing methods was used to learn about the range and functioning of complex households, how persons decide whom to list as part of their household, and problems with questionnaire design and wording. The aim was to learn about who was in the household on Census day (April 1, 2000) and movements in or out of households over the two or three intervening months to the time of the interview, and to explore how respondents defined key relationship terms, such as mother, foster child, adopted child, and other terms.

2.5 Ethnographic Interviews

Each ethnographer conducted interviews with respondents of his/her chosen ethnic group in 25 complex households between May and July of 2000[12] during the census nonresponse followup operation. Respondents were paid $35 for participating in the study and interviews were audiotaped with the consent of the respondent (except among Koreans who refused to allow audiotaping). The interview consisted of the following steps.

- At the beginning of the interview, the ethnographer conducted a modified cognitive test of the Census 2000 form without any probing. He/she handed the respondent a copy of the Census 2000 short form questionnaire (hereafter referred to as the mock census form to distinguish it from the actual Census 2000 form) and asked him/her to

[12] The African American ethnographic study described in this report was conducted in the spring and summer of 2002. This replaced an earlier ethnographic study conducted during the same time period as the other studies reported here that had methodological flaws.

complete items up to and including the relationship question as if he/she had received the form in the mail. Koreans and Latinos were given census forms in their own languages, if they preferred, while the remainder were given forms in English.[13] The ethnographer was to observe how the respondent completed the form and listen to what was said while remaining neutral and nondirective. The aims here were to allow the respondent to decide independently whom to list as being part of the household and to identify problems he/she may have had with specific questions and/or the form.

- After the respondent had completed the form, the ethnographer collected basic demographic information on the persons who had been listed and anyone else the ethnographer thought might be a potential member of the household.

- The ethnographer used coverage probes to learn whether there might be other people who should have been included on the census form (known as "omissions") or persons included on the census form who live somewhere else most of the time and should not have been included on the respondents' census form (persons who might be counted in more than one place, known as "erroneous enumerations").

- Next, the ethnographer asked the respondent to give the relationship of each person to every other person in the household. The ethnographer recorded how the respondent defined the relationship (the "emic" answer) and the exact relationship according to official Census Bureau rules (the "etic" answer).[14]

- Respondents were asked how they defined key relationship terms, such as "mother," "husband or wife," "foster child" and other relationships, and the ethnographer asked about the social and economic functioning of the household.

- The ethnographer did qualitative assessments of the standard of living of his/her respondents, using his/her own questions as well as observations of the respondents and their housing units. Households were classified as low low, low, lower middle, middle, and upper middle in their standard of living.

---

[13] Tongue's cultural liaison, a Navajo man, translated the questions into the Navajo language for those who did not speak or read English well. In some Navajo, Inupiaq, and Latino cases where the respondent could not read the form, the cultural liaison or ethnographer read the questions to respondents and filled in the answers on the census forms.

[14] "Emic" and "etic" are social science categories used to distinguish the insiders' views of their own culture from a single outside classification system applicable to all cultures. The terms were coined by linguist Kenneth Pike (1954), based on the differences between phon**emic** (having to do with meaning) and phon**etic** (concerned with the form) analyses of words.

Interviews averaged around 90 minutes, with some shorter and others much longer. Tongue's interviews lasted several hours because of the need to explain the study and reassure Navajos that participation would not lead to the loss of their lands, as has happened too often in the past, and to follow Navajo conventions of engaging in general conversation before beginning the task.

2.6 Second Ethnographic Conference and Statistical Research Division Colloquium on Complex Households

We held a second ethnographic conference on September 7, 2000 to share results. All project members presented results in a Statistical Research Division Colloquium entitled, "Results of Exploratory Ethnographic Research on Complex Households among African Americans, Hispanics, Inupiaq Eskimos, Koreans, Navajos and Whites." A videotape is available.

2.7 Reports, Data, and Videotapes Resulting from This Project

We have a wealth of reports[15] and data on complex households from this project, including 1) final ethnographic project reports and executive summaries; 2) audiotapes and detailed interview summaries; 3) mock census forms completed by respondents under cognitive interviewing conditions; 4) completed demographic and relationship grids; 5) videotape of presentations by each ethnographer at the September, 2000 Statistical Research Division Seminar on Complex Households at Census Bureau headquarters; and 6) papers presented at professional meetings.

2.8 Followup Research

Additional information on this project and small-scale followup studies to expand the focus of the research described here will be provided in a book that is currently being written. The title will be "Who Lives Here?": Complex Ethnic Households in America.

2.9 Applying Quality Assurance Procedures

This project began in late 1999 and the ethnographic data collection was completed by the summer of 2000. Quality assurance procedures were introduced and instituted through the Census Bureau at the time the ethnographers were completing their final reports. We applied quality assurance procedures to analyze data and prepare this report.

---

[15] Project reports, other documents and the videotape are listed in Appendix D.

3. LIMITS

When considering the results of the evaluation, keep in mind several limits:

- These results from the specific ethnic groups are not generalizable to the wider OMB race and ethnicity categories listed in Table 4. Wide variations occur among ethnic groups falling into the overall categories of white, black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Latino, and Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander.

- These results aren't generalizable to any larger population of these specific ethnic groups. Variations may occur within specific ethnic groups by geography, income, education, age, and many other factors. While the ethnographers made every effort to select a range of complex households appropriate to their specific ethnic groups in their chosen communities at various stages of the life cycle, the results are exploratory and suggestive, not conclusive. They provide a useful introduction to cultural differences in conceptions of key terms, such as "household," and relationship categories and to differences in the range and functioning of complex households among members of each ethnic group. These case studies are intended to identify further avenues for research.

- A variety of unique factors may have influenced the selection of complex households for study in each ethnic group and subsequent studies may not replicate these findings. These include such factors as differences among the ethnographers in types of households of particular interest; differences among community specialists and cultural liaisons in knowledge of the range of subgroups in the community; the accessibility of households, such as lack of specific addresses and directions to Navajo households or inability to gain entrance into locked apartment buildings in Queens, New York; and the willingness of persons to be interviewed. For example, Goerman, Blumberg and Craver had no problems in recruiting and completing interviews with Latino and Inupiaq respondents, while Tongue and Kang, especially, had many potential respondents decline to be interviewed. Those respondents who agreed to be interviewed in their studies may or may not differ from those who declined, or from the overall population.

- These ethnographic studies were conducted prior to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack. Since then, immigration regulations have been tightened and Korean and Latino respondents may be even more likely to refuse interviews or edit their responses to specific questions due to fears about confidentiality breaches among federal government agencies and fears of deportation.

4. RESULTS[16]

4.1 The Range and Functioning of Complex Households within the Six Ethnic Groups

4.1.1 Navajo Complex Households

Nancy Tongue conducted her field research with Navajos, the largest of all Indian tribes in the United States. All but two of her interviews during the initial research in the spring of 2000 were conducted in Arizona on the Navajo reservation, a very large, sparsely populated area that is, in many areas, ethnically and tribally homogeneous. Most of Tongue's respondents lived on unmarked and unnamed roads and had no mailboxes at or near their homes. They use post office box numbers for addresses; these boxes are usually located miles away at trading posts or general stores.[17] These households were very isolated and difficult to reach, and were it not for her cultural liaison, a full Navajo named Leo Tsinnijinnie, telling her to turn left at this rock formation or right at that sheep flock, she would have had great difficulty finding respondents' homes. Few households had telephones. Most of her respondents either did not speak English or were not fully literate.

According to Tongue, it was essential to hire and work closely with a cultural liaison for several reasons: to identify complex households and potential respondents; to locate their households; to show that a well-known and respected Navajo was a co-researcher on the project; to engage them in culturally appropriate conversational styles; to lessen well-founded fears that cooperating with a white person in a government-funded study would lead to loss of land and/or other resources, as has happened in the past; to translate between English and Navajo; and to help her understand Navajo responses and behavior from the Navajo perspective.

Even with Tsinnijinnie's assistance, Tongue says that it would often take hours to explain the study and convince people to participate and many either declined outright or could not be located after they had agreed to be interviewed. Tongue documents how she ended up with a very different sample of respondents than she had initially recruited. She had to explain the

---

[16] In this section, the author provides ethnographic sketches that rely heavily on material written by the ethnographers in their final project reports, but seen from the sometimes different perspective of a Census Bureau employee. The author read through all of the 150 interview summaries and chose case studies to describe in this section based on issues and living situations of particular interest and relevance to the Census Bureau. The resulting text in this section may cover cases not described in the final reports of the ethnographers and may diverge in some places from the interpretations of the ethnographers. The ethnographers' own executive summaries and final reports will be available on request.

[17] Tongue notes that in census operations that involve locating persons or matching them between data collections, we should not consider the geographical location of Navajo persons' post office boxes to be accurate indicators of the location of their residences.

project at length and repeatedly to Navajo people who had lost land and sheep in the past for cooperating with the government and were mistrustful of the government's intentions for conducting the study and using the data. Additionally, life on the reservation is often not scheduled and Navajo people remain somewhat nomadic, far less attached to specific households and schedules than those in mainstream American society, so in many cases visits that were scheduled ahead of time did not result in completed interviews.

Navajos traditionally lived in temporary round hogans, moving throughout the year from one sheep camp to another (see, for example, Downs 1972 or many other Navajo ethnographic studies). Tongue asserts that political and economic changes have led to alterations in Navajo household composition. Over time, Navajos were forced to move closer together in a more circumscribed area because of U.S., Navajo, and, more recently, Navajo-Hopi politics. Continuing building moratoriums and freezes on development affecting who receives electricity and water have prevented some Navajos from expanding their homes or building other dwellings near their homes and hogans and some people doubled up. At the same time, the Navajo Housing Authority built new rectangular homes close to roads, schools and other services and made them available at low or no cost. Many Navajo moved to these new homes from traditional round hogans but are uncomfortable living close to other people in these nontraditional houses. Tongue says that some people who would not traditionally have chosen to live together now share dwellings to have access to power and water. Economic necessity is another reason why family members may move in with others. According to one respondent:

> It is traditional to live in small families next to one another, helping each other out. It is only after land reform issues and relocation and with people not being able to get land that we are moving in with relatives and sleeping in the same houses with each other. Traditionally we would not have lived that way. Each nuclear family would have lived in its own house and the elders would still have lived alone but would have been taken care of by the daughters living next door with their families.

Environmental and economic factors also affect household composition and mobility. The climate is arid, vegetation in most areas is sparse, and the number and size of crops that can be grown are limited. The reservation is primarily rural and there are insufficient non-agricultural jobs to support the population. As a result, most of the respondents in Tongue's households were "either self-employed and working at home tending sheep, doing beadwork, pottery making or weaving, or are retired, unemployed or on disability."

4.1.1.1. Mobility, Residential Ambiguity and Frequent Shifts in Household Type

Most of Tongue's households also had at least one adult male with a trade skill who left the reservation intermittently to take temporary jobs in construction or at power plants elsewhere in Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, or in other states. These jobs are of variable length; some household members are gone for a few months, return for a few months and go out again, while

others may be gone to distant locations like California for more than six months. Sometimes grandchildren are left with their grandparents or aunts temporarily or permanently.

Households 607 and 621 illustrate mobility patterns in households with persons who leave the reservation temporarily to work:

Household 607 A stepson (of persons one and two), his wife, and their six children generally stay at the reservation home of Person One and Person Two, as they have no other home of their own. Three months ago, this stepson got a temporary job in Colorado. He, his wife, and two of their six children went to Colorado, where they stay in a motel. They think of the reservation household as their home. The respondent thinks they'll come back here to the reservation home to stay when the job is completed. We don't know how long this job will last or whether the stepson intends to come back when it is over. The stepson's four other children remained in this reservation household with their grandparents. Should the stepson, his wife and the two children in Colorado be listed in the actual census as members of this reservation household?

If the stepson, his wife, and their two children are counted in the reservation household, the household would be characterized as a three generation married couple grandparent-maintained household with adult child, spouse, and grandchildren. If they are not counted in the reservation household, the household would be classified as a married couple grandparent-maintained skip generation household, without the adult child and his spouse. We would have the impression that the grandparents were supporting the four grandchildren and would not know that the parents are contributing money to this household and that they live here when they are not away on temporary jobs.

Household 621. Person One lists her husband, Person Two, on her mock census form, along with a grandson and two adult children. Her husband has been away working in California for seven months and expects to be there for another three months. He has already been recruited for another two-month job elsewhere when he completes the current job. By chance, Tongue interviewed at this household on a holiday weekend and this man was back home visiting for a few days. She asked him if he lives here more than half of the time. His reply was:

> I live here [in the reservation household] all of the time. This is my home. We don't live in California. This is our home, our land. We're just working in California because there is no work here. If there were a job here, I'd stay all the time. But they don't create jobs and so we have to leave. Lots of people have to leave like I do. ...We come back here and stay here for a couple of weeks or maybe a month and then we get up and go again....Economics has changed everything.[18]

---

[18] In her residence rule research, Gerber has had respondents express these exact sentiments about work-related residences.

This man, the husband of Person One, is clearly considered to be a household member by himself and his wife. While he has already been staying in one or more other places for more than six months and will continue to do so for at least another three months, he is gone only because he needs to earn money to support this household. He and his wife clearly believe he lives here and should be counted here, but he has not physically resided here most of the time in the past year. According to Census Bureau residence rules for yearly cycles, he should not be counted in this household. This case illustrates how the same concept, "usual residence," can be interpreted in different ways by the respondent and the Census Bureau. For the Census Bureau, this man spent more than half of the year at another place and hence did not have a "usual residence" here. For the respondent, it doesn't matter how long her husband has been gone; he has lived here for many years and will continue to do so. This disconnect between our residence rules and the way respondents determine who lives in their households may lead to miscounting in censuses.

If this man is included in this household, it would seem that the household would be classified as a married couple three-generation household. If this man is not included, it would appear to be a female householder three generation household (because we didn't collect marital status in Census 2000). There are more issues with this household that we will explore later.

According to Tongue, a number of people in her study worked away most of the year and should have been counted wherever they spent more than 50 percent of their time. In reality, the majority of people in these living situations listed themselves, or were included by others, as living in their "home" on the reservation, where they "belong." Most did not list themselves being where they actually were on Census Day; that would have negated their sense of Navajo identity.

Mobility is not limited to those Navajo who leave the reservation for months at a time. Many people who stay on the reservation also move around frequently. According to Tongue, the majority of respondents spend time living, sleeping, or staying in more than one household during the year. Children, grandchildren, nieces, and nephews move easily between the homes of family members and often go where there is a better school or where a family has a dearth of children. Children might be counted in more than one place or not at all. Adults of working age may also move among relatives.

Households 608 and 609, which are interrelated, show frequent movement of children as well as adults and the difficulties of trying to establish who lives where definitively. Here is the information on household members from respondents in households 608 and 609 at two time periods: the interview dates in June, and whom they recall to have been in their households about eight weeks earlier on April 1, 2000 (Census Day).

On the interview date in June, household 608 in town consisted of Sheila,[19] her grandson Craig, her daughter Stella, and Stella's three children. On the next day, the respondent in household 609, some miles away near a sheep camp, was Sheila's daughter-in-law Denise, who was married to Sheila's son Ricky. Denise listed herself, her husband Ricky, and her child, along with three nephews who were staying there for a few months to attend school while their parents worked far away. She also listed her father-in-law, Myron, on her mock census form as part of her household. During the open-ended interviewing stage, however, Tongue was able to ascertain that Myron lived in the same household *cluster*, but not in the same *house*, as Sheila, so he shouldn't really be included as a member of household 609. Myron is the husband of Sheila, the respondent in household 608.

The respondents in households 608 and 609 were also asked to recall who was living in their respective households on Census Day, about eight weeks earlier and the results show that there has been much movement in and out and exchange of personnel. Sheila, in household 608, reported that her grandson Craig had been living with her at census time too, but that Stella and her three children had not yet moved in. However, Sheila went on to identify some other people who had been living with her around April 1, 2000 but who had since left. On Census Day, Sheila's husband, Myron, was living in her household, as was another son with his wife and their child (who apparently have left the area since Census Day).

Over in household 609, Denise recalled that around April 1, Myron *and* Sheila were living in *his* house. Stella and her three children were living in Stella's trailer right near Myron's house, and Stella's sister, Marilou, was living in her own house in this same family compound. Marilou, it turns out, is the mother of Craig, who has been living continuously in household 608 with Marilou's mother, Sheila. Sheila's house is much closer to the school that Craig attends, so he stays with his grandmother, rather than with his mother.

Denise's own household (609) appeared to have been the only one that remained stable during the period between April 1 and the interview day. However, Denise reported that earlier on the actual day of the interview, her husband Ricky had gone to take a temporary job elsewhere for the summer. In a week or so, her nephews would be leaving her household to go live with their parents who had settled into a new job in a distant community. In two weeks or so, just she and her child will remain in this household. Hence Denise's household is also changing.

---

[19] In presenting these case studies, two actions have been taken to preserve confidentiality of respondents. First, the names used in the case studies are not the real names of people in these households; pseudonyms have been used in all cases. Second, in some cases, the number of people in the household and/or some of their characteristics and unique circumstances may have been changed to protect confidentiality. In no case was any change made in these case studies that would alter the classification of household type, according to Census Bureau edits for constructing that variable.

With all of the movement of relatives back and forth between Sheila's house and the compound her husband Myron lives in, it is very likely that Sheila and Myron, Craig, Denise's nephews, and possibly other members of this very large extended family were either counted more than once or missed.

Another point to make is that Sheila remembered that Myron was staying at her house in town with her on Census Day, while Denise remembered that both Myron and Sheila were staying at the sheep farm on the same day. This would double count both Sheila and Myron. Was Sheila right about Census Day residents, or was Denise? Given the frequent mobility of people in these households, it is probably impossible to determine which, if either, of the rosters truly reflected who was living at each place on Census Day, more than two months in the past. How do we decide which, if either, of these accounts of where people were living on Census Day is correct and should be taken as the Census Day address, and which should be deleted as an erroneous enumeration? Tongue didn't have an answer to this.

This raises an issue about the Census Bureau's methods in evaluating coverage. In our coverage evaluation studies, our interviewers contact a sample of households three or more months after Census Day and ask the respondents about who was living in the household on Census Day. We are relying on the assumption that respondents can accurately recall who was living in their house on one specific day several months ago. To Census employees, April 1, 2000 was a very important day. To anyone not affiliated with the Census Bureau, April 1, 2000 was a typical, unremarkable day and there is no reason for them to remember who was in their household on that day in particular.[20]

It is not just Navajo children and adults of working age who move among households. Elderly widowed persons also may move back and forth between their own homes and their children's homes. They might refer to their traditional hogan where they weave and have sheep as "home" but actually spend more than half of their time sleeping or residing with other relatives. Some of the elders may be counted in more than one household or not counted at all. Tongue had three cases of this. Here is an example:

---

[20] The question as to how accurately respondents can recall who was living or staying in their household on a date of our defining at some point in the past came up in recent cognitive interviewing on another project related to matching persons who were in both Census 2000 and the Current Population Survey in 2000. After respondents were asked if certain persons lived or stayed in their household on April 1, 2000 (a date in the past) and a few additional questions, Nichols and Schwede asked a retrospective probe: "Were you thinking about April 1, 2000 specifically, or thinking about that time more generally?" Virtually all of the respondents indicated they were thinking more generally (that is, not focused on our specific reference date). This raises questions about the accuracy of data on Census Day residents collected in reinterviews taking place several months later (Nichols and Schwede 2002).

Household 620 - This household consists of a married couple, two grandchildren from different parents, and possibly the mother-in-law of Person One. The 81-year old mother-in-law has her own hogan some distance away. She usually stays alone in her hogan during the summer but during other cold seasons she mostly stays at this house. At the time of the interview (late May), she sleeps in this house, then spends part of her days up at her hogan, and returns to this household. Sometimes she will spend three to four days in a row here and then spend that much time at her hogan. Other times she goes back and forth each day. Should this woman be counted in household 620? She has her own hogan, but is spending about equal time here and there at the time of the interview, if residence rules concerning daily and weekly mobility cycles are applied. If a yearly mobility cycle is considered, it appears she has spent more than half of the year here. It's very doubtful the respondent could recall exactly where her mother-in-law was staying on the exact date of April 1, 2001. Which is the correct residence rule to apply to determine where she should be counted? When we brought this case to the attention of the residence rule experts in Population Division, it was decided she should be counted in this household because she has spent more than half of the year at this place. That would make this a three-generation, rather than a two-generation, married couple family.

In conclusion, household composition in Navajo households is fluid and shifting; there may be no clear, unambiguous answer as to where some Navajo should be counted. In some cases, this may be due to true uncertainty as to who was living in a household on a certain day. Household type may thus shift often as a result of mobility of one or more members.

Seventeen of Tongue's 25 households had a change in household members in the six to eight weeks between Census Day on April 1, 2000 and the time of their interview for this project in late May or early June! Tongue says that it was difficult not only for her as an anthropologist, but also for the Navajos themselves, to determine who is really part of specific households. Some households were simply impossible to classify. She points to one case in which an adult son was so mobile that neither his mother (the respondent), his girlfriend, or he himself could definitively state where he lived!

4.1.1.2. Definition of Household

As mentioned earlier, the Census Bureau's concept of "household" refers to all of the people who live in one housing unit, while our residence rules are based on the concept of "usual residence," the place where people live or stay "most of the time." Census 2000 counted households based on this definition and a predetermined method that were not congruent with how some people categorized their own homes.

According to Tongue, the building structure or physical dwelling in which people live is of minimal importance to Navajos and is not the important factor in defining "household:"

> Navajos tend to define "household" according to a certain set of criteria. They consider household members to be relatives with whom they feel emotionally close, or with whom they cook, eat, and spend time. They might also include family members who share the responsibility of tending sheep, corn, or other crops. They could include those with whom they share vehicles, gasoline for those vehicles or for generators, or who share appliances. (Tongue Executive Summary 2000: 5).

Tongue reports that it is common for Navajo people to live in clusters of nuclear family units on matrilineal land. Often an older couple or widower live in one dwelling and the grown daughters, and sometimes sons, lived in adjacent homes with their children. Often, some or all of these people share domestic and economic functions, such as cooking and eating together, caring for children, sharing money and/or economic resources such as sheep, vehicles, and generators and swapping sleeping places. Tongue calls these conjoined households[21] and she found nine of them.

These family groups are clearly interconnected and interdependent. In the words of one Navajo respondent:

> My daughter's family someday will have their own permanent house next door. They will never really live more than a house away from some of their children because it needs to be like a tree with branches and roots nearby.

This quote demonstrates that despite all of the mobility on and off the reservation, the place where Navajos say they live and consider to be home is usually tied somehow to the maternal land on the reservation. According to Tongue (personal communication) this is where the family flock of sheep are or were retained. Usually there is a post office box associated with this residence. By having a post office where the sheep are located, they are eligible to vote in that region's tribal election to advocate for the best land use laws.

According to Tongue, Navajo often have more than one P.O. box and, as mentioned earlier, these boxes may be quite far from where people actually live. Over the decades, Navajo have been adversely affected by laws, policies, and politics regarding their land, sheep, and livelihoods, and some have learned ways to get the best benefits. They may use different post office boxes to gain the best benefits, say, using one box to get the best car registration benefits, another for public assistance, or another for tax purposes. This suggests that people with more than one residence may decide which is in their best interest to provide, given the data collection, its sponsor, and its purpose. We may want to conduct research to determine what factors people consider when deciding which address or post office number to use when they receive forms at different addresses, or when they complete a Be Counted census form that is not associated with a specific address. A study by Hainer, Hines, Martin and Shapiro (1988) discussed a number of rational

---

[21] The term typically used by anthropologists for these social households that extend across separate housing units is "household compounds."

reasons why respondents might decide, considering their self-interests, to answer census forms differently from how we want them to complete the forms.

For the Navajo, then, there is no one-to-one correspondence between housing units and households, as there is in the census definitions. In her interviews, Tongue found that a significant number of respondents identified relatives living in adjacent or more distant homes as members of their households. For example:

The respondent in case 621, described above, listed her husband, a grandson, and two adult children on her mock census form. This is the household where the husband has been away for more than half the year at a temporary job. During open-ended interviewing, Tongue was able to determine that her two adult children and their nephew (the respondent's grandson) actually lived in a separate house adjacent to the respondent's house. The respondent's husband said:

> We're all one unit. We're not apart. We should all be counted together as one family, one household, one group. We all eat together in one kitchen.

They also share their incomes and a refrigerator.

It is interesting to note that reckoning relationships just from the old woman meant the child was classified as a grandchild. From this we might assume that the parent of the grandchild is the natural born offspring of either the respondent's seemingly coresident son or daughter. In actuality, he is the son of their sister who has gone off to marry a non-Navajo and it seems as though she's abandoned him. This is an example of how asking for relationships only to Person One can mask the true interrelationships in the household.

Conversely, Tongue also found that not all people within one housing unit consider themselves to be one household. Some relatives who lived together in one hogan considered themselves to be two different households under the *same* roof.

Household 614 The elderly woman respondent listed three people as living in her hogan: her husband, her adult son, and herself. This did not seem right and Tongue probed. She learned that ten people sleep here. Two of the respondent's grandchildren whose mother is absent–a boy of four and a girl of six–live here most of the time, but the respondent forgot to list them. One was away that week, sleeping at a nearby boarding school; the other was not listed because he was small and she didn't know if he counted. Five other relatives were also sleeping in this hogan: the respondent's 29 year old daughter and her four children. The respondent explained that she did not consider this daughter and her children to be part of her own household, because they "have a separate refrigerator next to ours and they keep their money separate and we have separate P. O. Box numbers."[22] The daughter concurred with this assessment and said that in the

[22] These criteria for determining residence were found in previous residence rule research by Eleanor Gerber (1990).

actual census, they were listed as separate households, even though they live in the same hogan and share the same outhouse. The respondent had applied for permission to build a cinder block house nearby for her daughter and her children to move into. In this case, it appears the respondent may not have considered her daughter's subfamily to be part of the household because they were considered to be temporary residents and were expected to move, even though it might take more than a year.

In this case, the household composition resulting from the respondent's determination of who was and wasn't a household member was a nuclear family with three persons (married couple and adult child). However, according to our Census rules that a household is comprised of all persons who share a housing unit and that children away at boarding school should be counted at their homes, the official household composition should have been a three-generation household of ten persons, with a subfamily.

This is another case in which we note the masking of relationships that would have occurred here, had the respondent listed her grandchildren as well as her daughter and her daughter's children. The two grandchildren are the offspring of another daughter of the respondent who is living elsewhere. With relationships reckoned to the grandmother only, there would have been six grandchildren and two adult children; it would have seemed to be a stovepipe multigenerational household. This is really a multigenerational, laterally extended household that could not be identified as such, figuring relationships just to Person One.

After analyzing her data and trying to decide where each person lived in order to write her final report, Tongue came to the conclusion that some Navajo households are simply impossible to classify accurately. In one Navajo household, a man sometimes lived with his mother, sometimes with his girlfriend in a temporary place, and sometimes with his girlfriend at her mother's house. This man could not decide where he lived, neither could his mother or his girlfriend. Given the ambiguity of these people's statements and his very mobile pattern among three or more households, Tongue could not resolve where he should be counted.

In summary, differing conceptions of who should be considered a household member and mobility of people of all ages among households and other types of places on and off the reservation are key factors likely to lead to enumeration errors of Navajos in censuses as well as to shifting household types, and in some cases, misleading household types. Based on her research, Tongue concludes that Navajo adults may be overcounted and children undercounted.

4.1.1.3. Matrilineal Kinship System and Relationship Categories Differing from those of Mainstream American Society

The Navajos have a matrilineal kinship system which differentiates relatives on the maternal and paternal sides. Paternal grandparents are not the lateral equivalents of maternal grandparents. The grandchild of one's son is a "nali" and the grandchild of one's daughter is a "tsui." To deal

with the typical relationship question and categories on census and survey forms, such as "grandchild," Navajos first have to specify if the grandchild is from the maternal or paternal side before deciding what relationship category to mark, sometimes marking the "other relative" category and writing in "nali" or "tsui" and other times not marking any relationship category. This may explain why some Navajo choose not to check the "grandchild" box offered on the form. Tongue notes that when "grandchild" was checked, it inevitably meant the child of one's daughter, or a "tsui," never a "nali." The distinction of maternal and paternal kin also applies to aunts/uncles and other relatives.

In summary, the Navajo ethnographic study identified a number of factors that may affect household types and relationships, as well as the accuracy of the census count. Among these factors are 1) high mobility rates, for a variety of purposes and durations, including cyclical movements from and back to the reservation for temporary employment lasting weeks or months for adults of working age, frequent movements of children for purposes of schooling or living with another relative, and daily/weekly/seasonal movements of elderly widowed relatives, and resulting in residential ambiguity; 2) Navajo cultural conception of "household" as a unit based on social ties and interaction that may lead to confusion when asked about persons who live together in one physical unit; 3) Navajos' tendencies to live in household compounds with matrilineal kin in separate houses but on the same family's land; and 4) the Navajo matrilineal kinship system that classifies relatives differently from the bilateral kinship system of mainstream America.

Recommendations for improving Navajo enumeration would center around training for enumerators, since Indian reservations are enumerated in personal visit interviews, rather than with mailout forms. Special training modules could be developed to identify these and additional factors that might affect the quality and comparability of Navajo data and to suggest culturally appropriate methods enumerators could use to obtain comparable data.

4.1.2 Inupiaq Eskimo Complex Households

Amy Craver conducted research with Inupiaq Eskimos who live in small rural native communities in northern Alaska. These villages are in a very large, sparsely populated area that is geographically remote. The environment is harsh and demanding. There are few full time jobs in the rural areas of Alaska; the unemployment rate is nearly 50 percent and the cost of living is three times higher than the national average. The community economies are based on a combination of cash and subsistence activities. Eighteen of Craver's households relied on subsistence resources for more than half of their household diet.

The subsistence lifestyle requires seasonal movements for hunting, fishing and gathering. In the study villages, men take day trips to hunt and go ice fishing during the winter. Women often return to their natal households for two months or so because of labor demands for subsistence. Between June and August, families engage in subsistence activities together lasting from a few

days to a month. Many leave during this period, camping on their own or with others for spring hunting and whaling, summer fishing and fall berry picking. The Inupiat hunt caribou, moose, seal, whale, ptarmigan, rabbit, and waterfowl; catch a variety of fish; gather eggs; and pick berries. Interestingly, Craver notes that people don't usually consider the movements of whole families to be movements of household personnel. Over the 12 months preceding her interviews (May 1999 to June 2000), three quarters of her respondents had seasonal short-term shifts in household composition due to subsistence activities.

In addition to movements around the area due to subsistence activities, people travel to visit family and friends in other areas. There are also movements out of the communities to find full time work. Some people go out to take intermittent jobs and then return home for awhile before going out again. Others leave to get further education; Craver found in her villages that women were more likely to leave for this reason than men.

The environmental and economic conditions faced by the Inupiat are very similar to those faced by the Navajo. Like the Navajo, the Inupiat often live in family clusters that are interconnected and interdependent (unlike the Navajo, however, who cluster with maternal relatives, Inupiat form clusters with either maternal or paternal relatives). Sharing of resources and people across households is a way of life.

According to Craver's review of the anthropological literature, traditional Inupiaq Eskimo social organization was characterized by two levels: households and local family units. The most common types of households were comprised of 1) elderly parents with one or more adult children, their spouses, and their children, or 2) two or more adult siblings, their spouses and their children. Two or three households, often adjacent to one another, functioned as interdependent local family units. The strongest bonds were between parents and children, rather than between spouses, for children were needed for old age insurance. Adoption was common and the adopted parents were frequently their grandparents. Craver cites Burch (1975:130) as saying that the most common pattern of adoption was in three generation co-resident families. When the co-resident adult child decided to move out, the grandparents simply kept that adult child's first born child.

According to Craver, the majority of complex Inupiaq households share some form of domestic function with people in another residence:

> The social interdependence of Inupiaq Eskimo households is substantially different from that found among typical households in the United States. In contrast to non-native households, Inupiaq Eskimo households depend on immediate and extended family members for day-to-day support in the form of food, labor, and income. ...It is common for two or more households to be linked through kinship and to recognize themselves as a single domestic unit because they prepare and eat food together,[23] share equipment for

[23] The 1990 census definition of a "housing unit" specified that coresidents eat separately, but the 1990 census form did not include questions about household eating arrangements. "Eating separately" was deleted from the definition of "housing unit" for Census 2000. (Thompson 1997).

subsistence activities and look after children communally...Economically, many households would not be able to function without the assistance of other households. (Craver 2000: 18, 20).

Household 319 Two adult sons lived in an adjacent house. Their father considered them to be part of his household because they contribute subsistence food and eat all of their meals at his house.

Craver hired two local people to help her with logistics and locate complex households. This was easier for Craver than for the other ethnographers; about 25 percent of the households in her study communities lived in complex households. Having done previous research in these communities, she had already established bonds with people. Everyone she contacted agreed to participate in this study.

Five of Craver's 25 respondents were between 27 and 47 years old, while seven were between 48 and 61 and the remaining 13 were 62 or more years old. She interviewed more older people because they were more likely to 1) be the primary householders, 2) be more stable and less mobile, and 3) live in housing authority homes. Over half of her respondents did not complete high school, with some of those not completing grade school. About a quarter had earned high school diplomas and the remainder had finished some vocational school or college.

Most residents are able to work only sporadically, since few jobs are available. Fourteen of the 25 were employed at least part of the time between May of 1999 and 2000. Of these, six worked between six and twelve months, one worked from three to six months, five were employed from one to three months and two worked less than a week. Some have cyclical jobs:

Household 301 On the interview day, the elderly woman respondent said that her adopted son, James, his unmarried partner and their child lived in her household. This household composition was somewhat different from that on the March 1 reference date.[24] James' unmarried partner and his child were not living there as of March 1, but another person was: a son named Nathan. The household type here appears to be that of a female householder family: a woman and her two adult sons. In the middle of April, Nathan left on vacation for about six weeks. Nathan has an

---

[24] Recognizing that Alaska Natives have seasonal patterns of movement in the spring that could lead to an undercount if enumeration were done around April 1, the Census Bureau started conducting Census 2000 several months earlier in Alaska when many Inupiaq people would still be in their winter homes. In mid-January, 2000, former Census Director Kenneth Prewitt went to rural Alaska to help kick off the enumeration and a picture of him in heavy winter clothing riding in a snowmobile behind the driver appeared in many newspapers across the country. We did not know exactly when Craver's communities were actually enumerated, so we chose a reference date of March 1 to be the proxy Census Day for the Inupiat in our study. All of the other ethnic groups included in this study used the actual Census Day of April 1, 2000 as their reference date.

intermittent job that involves living at his distant worksite for three weeks at a time and then getting two weeks off before returning to work. During his time off, he divides his time between living here and visiting friends and relatives in surrounding areas.

Nathan is one of the types of mobile people who is tenuously attached to this household and at risk of being omitted or counted more than once. According to the Census Bureau's residence rules for weekly and annual mobility, Nathan should not have been included on this respondent's census form; he should have been enumerated at his worksite. Unfortunately, we don't have information about Nathan's living arrangement at the mine: whether he was in a housing unit or a labor camp. If he were in a housing unit at the worksite, he would be counted there. If he were in a labor camp at the time an enumerator was there, he would have been enumerated individually and could have used the "usual home elsewhere" option to specify his mother's address as his usual home. If he did this, he would be correctly counted at his mother's house. If he got the form at the labor camp and didn't specify a "usual home elsewhere" he would have been counted at the labor camp. However, if he was away from the labor camp at the time it was enumerated, he may have been missed in the census if his mother hadn't counted him.

This case demonstrates the various locations where Nathan could have been counted or missed, based on his tenuous attachments to more than one place.

4.1.2.1. Multigenerational Household Type is the Norm

There are three unique features of Inupiaq complex households in our study. First, the great preponderance of Craver's Inupiaq households were multi-generational: nineteen spanned three generations and two covered four generations. Just four were comprised of two generations. The mean number of people in her households was 5.44.

The second unique feature is that all but three of these multigenerational households were missing the second generation: working age adults. It appears that many of these adults left the area for work, education, or personal reasons and left some or all of their children with their grandparents.[25]

Household 320 As of the interview day, two grandsons were living with their grandmother. Around March 1, the boys' mother and four of their siblings were also living in this house. Later that month, their mother got a job in another community and took those four siblings with her and it seems she will stay there. One of those children spent the last school year here and may

[25] Ackerman (1988) reported a similar pattern among the Colville Indians in the northwest part of the United States. Many households consist of a grandmother and several grandchildren. This arrangement allows young adults (the parents) to travel and collect food unimpeded by the needs of young children.

return in the fall. The five of them often return to stay temporarily in this household. Once a month her son living here will fly up to stay with her.

This case demonstrates the continued ties to their natal homes of working age adults who leave with some or all of their children to work elsewhere; Craver says that this is the case with many such adults who leave to take jobs, but she did not explore continuing exchanges or transfers of money, food, goods and services between the young adults in their other locations and the natal household. Given the strong cultural emphasis on interdependence and sharing, we speculate that these adult children in other areas with greater economic opportunities send money and/or goods back to the rural village households to help support their parents and children. The departure of the adults may be a long-distance family economic strategy in response to the hardship and lack of full time jobs in the rural areas. Schwede identified and documented this pattern of out-migration as a long-distance family economic strategy being used to support kin in overpopulated rural villages in West Sumatra, Indonesia (Schwede 1991). This could be an hypothesis for further research among the Inupiat.

Craver notes that Inupiaq households have a stable foundation but mobile members: a core person remains in the household as its center while other members are frequently mobile. This is called an "anchor household" (Ackerman 1988, 2002) or a "key household" (Lobo 2003). There was not one move of an entire household in the two to three month period between March 1 and Craver's interviews in May and June. However, during the same time period, 14 of the 25 households had one or more members moving from one household to another. Of those households with people coming in during this three month period, four were due to children moving in for schooling, three were people going between relatives' households and one was due to illness. Of those households with people moving out, four moves were due to seeking full time employment, one was for seasonal work and the remaining one was due to going to live with a friend. Craver says Inupiaq residence is very flexible, with some people coming and going between households frequently. As a result, it is sometimes hard to determine household residence precisely. As we have seen, this is the case with Tongue's Navajo households as well.

4.1.2.2. Informal and Formal Adoption

The third unique feature of Inupiaq social organization is the very high frequency of adoption. Craver points out that informal adoption has been and continues to be a central part of Inupiaq Eskimo social organization. It is not unusual for a woman to give her child to her parents, siblings, or extended family members due to economic or social hardship or a variety of other reasons.

Household 315 A respondent listed his grandson on his mock census form at the time of the interview, but said that this boy was counted as part of his mother's household in the actual census because he was living with her at that time. The boy had lived with his grandfather from age one to eleven while his mother went to school, got married, and lived in another community.

Two years ago she moved back to this community. Since then, the boy has lived with his mother for short time periods, but has lived primarily with his grandfather. Here again, two of our residence rules are in conflict: the boy was living in his mother's house around the time of enumeration, but spends more of the year living with his grandfather. Where should he be counted and which residence rule should be applied: where he was living at the time of enumeration (*de facto*) or at his usual residence (*de jure*)? Depending on where this child is enumerated, the grandfather's household would be either male householder nonfamily household (living alone) or male householder family household (respondent and grandchild).

Fifteen of the 25 Inupiaq respondents had adopted children living with them; ten of these fifteen were grandparents who had adopted their grandchildren. Craver did not determine how many of these were formal or informal adoptions, but did say that adoptions are usually informal and legalized only if the child might be taken by the state. The children almost always know both their biological and adopted parents.

Does the official Census Bureau definition encompass both formal and informal adoption? According to the Census 2000 Technical Documentation, it does not:

> *Adopted son/daughter*. A son or daughter of the householder by legal adoption, regardless of the age of the child. If the stepson/stepdaughter of the householder has been legally adopted by the householder, the child is then classified as an adopted child. (U.S. Census Bureau 2002, Census 2000 Appendix B: Definitions of Subject Characteristics: B-10).

Many of us take for granted that our Census Bureau relationship categories are mutually exclusive, but this is an instance where they are not; it would be correct for a grandparent to answer the relationship question by marking both "grandchild" and "adopted child." Craver reports that Inupiaq respondents often marked "adopted child," rather than "grandchild."

This has the effect of distorting household composition: by marking adopted child, the household appears to be comprised of just two generations–parent and adopted child–when, in actuality, the household is a skip generation, multi-generational household.

Let us look again at case 301. The elderly respondent had said that her adopted son, his unmarried partner, and their child lived with her. Craver learned during open-ended interviewing that the respondent's adopted son is also her biological grandchild. On the basis of the relationship categories actually marked, this would be classified as a three-generation household. Since her adopted child is really her grandchild, this is really a four-generation family, with the second-generation mother missing. In this case, the grandchild had been formally adopted by his grandmother when the state threatened to take the child away from his mother.

The effect of marking "adopted child" rather than "grandchild" in many cases is that one full generation disappears from view and we classify the household as one generation shallower than it really is. We also miss the fact that it is a skip generation household.

However, it appears that the Census Bureau policy is that a legal relationship takes precedence over a biological relationship: hence "adopted child" is the correct answer. As a result the four-generation household composition will not be revealed. Since adoptions by grandparents are so common among the Inupiat, it is likely that our tabulations of the numbers of Inupiaq multigenerational households will be too low.

In summary, the important factors identified in the Inupiaq study that may affect household types and relationships, as well as the accuracy of the count include: 1) high mobility rates of working age adults in search of employment and/or subsistence, and separately, of children, leading to ambiguity of residence; 2) a preponderance of skip generation households in which grandparents are raising grandchildren [The grandparent(s) may be providing the anchor households, with the working age parents gone but probably helping to support the household economically and returning occasionally, but not being counted as residents of the household]; 3) high rates of adoption by grandparents–whether formal or informal–which may result in masking of the multi-generational/skip generational character of the household if respondents choose to mark their grandchildren as adopted children rather than as biological children, and 4) cultural conceptions of the household as an interdependent social unit not bounded by physical structure, at variance with the census definition of the household as a physical housing unit.

The Inupiat, like the Navajo, are enumerated in censuses through personal visits by trained enumerators, not by completing mailed out questionnaires. Recommendations include developing enumeration methods appropriate to Inupiaq settlement patterns, weather, and seasonal movements. Craver noted that the Census Bureau was right to conduct enumeration of the Inupiat during the winter while people remain fairly settled until the weather warms and they rove more freely. Specially adapted training materials could be developed to identify these and other factors that could lead to miscounting and to train enumerators to get comparable data in culturally appropriate questioning and probing.

4.1.3. Latino Complex Households

Patricia Goerman conducted interviews with Latino immigrants in central Virginia (Blumberg and Goerman 2000a, 2000b, forthcoming) and Rae Blumberg conducted focus groups in the same area. Both researchers are fluent in Spanish and have previously lived and worked in Spanish speaking countries; Blumberg has done research in many Central and South American countries over her career.

Goerman recruited complex household respondents at local churches, through community leaders who worked with Hispanics, and through snowball sampling. She had few problems recruiting

respondents in complex households. Most of the respondents were "extremely agreeable and cooperative." She gave respondents Spanish language census forms to complete during her visit and conducted her interviews in Spanish.

The Latino households ranged in size from three to twelve persons, with an average of 5.96 per household. The researchers did not ask specifically for the legal status of their respondents, but surmise that more than half of them were undocumented immigrants in this country illegally.

4.1.3.1. Definition of Household

The Census Bureau definition of a household as all of the persons living or staying in one housing unit was congruent with almost all of the Latino households included in this research. In one household in particular, however, the equation of one household with one housing unit did not fit the way the respondent defined her own household:

Household 122 - Goerman arrived at this address and found a two-story house. Her interview was scheduled with the woman who lived on the first floor, Consuela, who was not home. After waiting in vain, Goerman began interviewing Eva, another woman also living in this first floor apartment. From Eva, she learned that three families live in this house. Eva's family shares the first floor apartment with Consuela's family, but none of them are related to each other. Consuela's daughter and her nuclear family live upstairs. When Eva grew confused, stressed, and nervous about whom to include on the form, Goerman slipped out of her neutral role and told her to include the people living on the first floor. Eva obliged and wrote eight persons in the question 1 person count box on the mock census form, but then filled in just three of the person pages. She gave demographic information on her husband, then on the man from Consuela's family, then on herself. This was very odd, because she filled out information for herself and her husband, but not for her two children. Further, she gave information on just the adult male from the other family, but left off three other people. There really were eight people living there. Given this situation, we might have expected Eva to fill in the person pages for just those members of her own family. It appears she was filling in information on just those who had jobs. At this point Consuela finally arrived and joined the discussion. Consuela and Eva both said that they should be completing separate census forms because they were separate families.

On probing, Goerman learned that the families weren't related, and didn't cook together or share income. The only reason they were living together was that the two men Eva listed, one in each family sharing the apartment, worked for the same company and the boss owned this home and let them rent it at a discounted price. The two men living in this household were acquaintances who had met in Mexico because they came from the same village, but their common origin and common employer were the only connections between the two coresident, unrelated families.

According to our census definitions, these two families constitute just one household, but the respondents certainly don't identify themselves as one household. With our method of reckoning

relationships to Person One only, rather than to all other persons in the household, we would only learn about the relationships among Person One's family (Eva's family). In this case, all four of the persons in Consuela's family would be listed as nonrelatives to Person One; we would not know that those people are all related to each other and constitute a three-generation family.

Unrelated families, or related families who don't share domestic functions with each other, may very well balk at applying our census rules when deciding whom to list on a census form. It is not at all uncommon for Latino immigrants to double up in households in high rent areas. We will see this again in the Korean study. This may also be the case among many poor families, regardless of ethnicity, in high rent areas. The Census Bureau's equation that the number of households is equal to the number of housing units does not fit the reality of situations like this.

As a result, in cases like this, we may be faced with three types of errors: 1) omissions of persons living in households but not considered to be members by the respondent, 2) incomplete information on domestic functioning and economic well-being, and 3) masking of household composition of other unrelated families in the household, because they would all be listed as nonrelatives to the householder (we do not collect information on interrelationships of all persons in the household).

4.1.3.2. Language issues

Blumberg and Goerman report they found some language issues while having respondents complete the Spanish version of the census form. There is a potential problem with the concept of "household" that has to do with how it is translated from English and how it is tested for functional equivalence. The word used for household on the Spanish version of the census form is "*hogar*." "*Hogar*" is the term used on Census forms in some Spanish-speaking countries and it is a term that people commonly use in referring to their own households.

Goerman asked thirteen of her Latino respondents in our complex households project to define "*hogar*." Twelve of the thirteen defined it as the place where a nuclear family resides; the word implies only parents and children and "home." The nuclear family was found to be the ideal for many of her respondents. Ten of the thirteen thought *"hogar"* could also apply to an extended family member. When asked whether it would be an appropriate word to use for coresident nonrelatives, five of the respondents said no.

Goerman later did more interviews with married or cohabiting couples as followup research. Again she found consensus that the word "*hogar*" implies coresident parents and children; some thought the concept could include extended family members (Goerman forthcoming). A few thought the term might cover coresiding nonfamily persons if they considered themselves to be like a family and functioned as such.

Goerman also points out that many of her immigrant respondents are here temporarily, have left close family members such as children or parents in the home country, and travel back and forth. They belong to two households, one here, the other in their home country, contributing money to both. In their view, their true *hogar* is in their home country.

For example, Fernando lives in an apartment with his wife and nephew. They left their three young children in Mexico to avoid exposing them to the dangers of crossing the border. They want to return to Mexico as soon as possible to establish their own home. When asked to define *hogar*, Fernando answered:

> Well, I don't know, right now it's like I don't have one because my children aren't here, but when I was in Mexico I went to work [for very long hours and]...I would say "ay, how I long to be in my *casa*, house, in my *hogar* with my family."

She concludes that:

> The overwhelming association of the word *hogar*, or home, with family, either nuclear or extended, and with different values such as harmony, love, respect, and understanding show that respondents do not necessarily consider just any group of coresidents to be an *hogar* or home just because they live together under one roof. This has important implications for filling out questionnaires such as the census form. If a respondent does not consider every resident of his/her household to be an official member of his/her home, it is likely that not everyone will be counted. (Goerman forthcoming: 26)

According to Blumberg, "*hogar*" is the word used for households in censuses in Latin American countries, but it seems not to be an exact functional equivalent of our word "household." Goerman suggests testing alternative Spanish words, such as *casa, apartamento o casa móvil* (house, apartment or mobile home), or *domicilio, residencia* or *vivienda* (dwelling).

Goerman found there is quite a discrepancy between the English terms of "live" and "stay" and the official Spanish translations of these terms into *vivir* and *quedarse* on the census form. *Vivir*, like live, implies a permanent living situation. However *quedarse* is ambiguous; it can be used in the sense English speakers use "stay" to connote a temporary situation, such as staying at a hotel or at someone's house, but it can also be used in the sense of "remaining somewhere" which has permanent connotations.[26] Five respondents leaned toward the interpretation of the word as permanent and three as temporary. The remaining five said it could go either way and that more detail would be needed to determine which meaning of *quedarse* was intended.

---

[26] We asked the ethnographers to explore differences in the meanings of "live" and "stay" among the different ethnic groups because of differences Eleanor Gerber had found in the meanings of these terms in English in her residence rule research in the 1990s. The findings in Spanish for *vivir* and *quedarse* in terms of permanence are identical to those in English.

Goerman points out that if respondents interpret *quedarse* as staying permanently, they might leave off the census form people who are just staying temporarily. The combination of mixed connotations of *quedarse* in question 1 on the census form and the connotation of *hogar* as a nuclear, or at most extended family may both lead to omission of nonrelatives or distant relatives from census forms by Latinos and be a source of undercounting. Carrasco, who has done several studies concerning language issues with monolingual and bilingual Spanish speakers (Carrasco 2003a; Carrasco 2003b; and Carrasco and Musquiz 2003), argues that census and survey questionnaires translated from English into Spanish need to be pretested in Spanish to determine if there are problems in the new language and, if so, to determine whether the problems are due to translation or non-translation issues.

There is also ambiguity among some Spanish speakers about whether the terms *esposo/esposa* are the functional equivalents of our English relationship terms, husband/wife. A number of respondents thought that these terms should be restricted to persons who are legally married and use the terms *marido/mujer* for unmarried partners. However, other respondents said that *esposo/esposa* and *marido/mujer* are interchangeable. One respondent said that in the U.S. when people live together, they are called girlfriend and boyfriend:

> We wouldn't do that in Mexico. If they live together you'd call them *esposos* (spouses).

If this is true, there may be a disproportionate share of unmarried couples being classified as married couples relative to the proportions in other ethnic groups. Among Latinos who are cohabiting, there is more of a commitment to a long-term relationship than there is among non-Latino Americans, according to Goerman (personal communication 2003)

This suggests the possibility that there may be different connotations of common Spanish words by dialect and/or nationality. The possibility of such dialectal and/or cross-national differences in the interpretation of key words on the Spanish language form and the effects of this on differential coverage by Latino nationality might be a fruitful area for future research.[27]

This also has implications for the validity and reliability of household types, particularly in the distributions of married couple and unmarried couple families. If Spanish speakers from Mexico are more likely than Spanish speakers from other countries and/or English speakers to mark *esposo/esposa* for their unmarried partners, our comparative statistics could be biased. We will see that differential use of the husband/wife categories by unmarried partners is found among other ethnic groups as well, including rural non-Hispanic whites.

---

[27] Carrasco and Musquiz (2003b) conducted focus groups with bilingual Census employees to identify functional equivalents of the English concepts of married couples and unmarried couples in Spanish. According to them, Spanish speakers recognize the word, "*pareja*," as not married, but having a spouse-like relationship. They point out that not everyone may use this term as a matter of choice, but most understand it as intended by census designers.

Goerman also found that the Spanish translation of "foster child" into "*hijo de crianza*" is not functionally equivalent. This came to light when one of Goerman's respondents marked the relationship category "*hijo de crianza*" for his coresident niece and nephew. Because "foster child" is classified as a nonrelative, by the Census Bureau, the close biological tie between the respondent and his niece and nephew were not identified on this respondent's mock census form. The household was classified as a male householer-nonfamily household, when it was really a male householder family household.

She learned that in Spanish, "*hijo de crianza*" is used to refer to a child who was being brought up for a relative or a friend. Raising a child of a friend or relative is a common practice in Latino countries that is done on an informal, not legal, basis. There is no connotation in Spanish cultural usage of a nonrelated child being placed in a home by a government agency, which is how foster child is defined by the Census Bureau. As a result of the mismatch between "foster child" and "*hijo de crianza*" it is likely that we find artificially high numbers of foster households and foster children among Latinos in the census. Carrasco and Musquiz documented the same problem in their report on focus groups with bilingual field representatives (2003b).

Goerman asked her respondents about the differences between "*hijo de crianza*" (foster child) and "hijo adoptivo" (adopted child). Most of her respondents said there was no difference between the two; they are interchangeable. The relative counts of foster children and adopted children might also be skewed for Spanish speakers if significant numbers are not differentiating between the two.

There is one relationship that is important to Latinos that is not included in our relationship categories. This is the relationship of godparents, sometimes called coparents. Either relatives or nonrelatives may be asked to become godparents to a child. The godparent relationship is often considered to be familial, even when the godparent is otherwise a nonrelative. Blumberg and Goerman suggest that the identification of coresident godparents on the census form would give us a more precise picture of Latino families. Goerman and Blumberg had no specific cases of persons coresiding with godparents, but suggest this is possible. Chavira-Prado (2001) reports from her study of Mexican former farm workers in the midwest that godparents (*compadres*) often foster their godchildren (*ahijados*) and that Mexican teenage males emigrating for the first time commonly join the households of their godfathers (*padrinos*) or blood relatives. It is unlikely that this new relationship term would be added to the census as a stand-alone category because 1) godparents can be relatives and respondents might mark "godparent" instead of a closer relative term, or mark both categories in a question permitting only one response, and 2) the category would make sense to some people but confuse many others.

Goerman's identification of conceptual problems and errors stemming from the English to Spanish translation of key concepts--household (*hogar*), stay (*quedarse*), husband/wife (*esposo/esposa*), foster child (*hijo de crianza*), and unmarried partner (*companero no casado*)–and their use on census forms without testing, and the fact that many Spanish speaking

respondents use foster child and adopted child interchangeably, suggests that the new Census Bureau program of research on translation and differing cultural conceptions of key terms is very much needed. Census researchers, specifically Lorena Carrasco, Manuel de la Puente, and our first sociolinguist, Yuling Pan, are working on these issues.

4.1.3.3. Latino Naming Customs Differ from Those in Mainstream American Culture

Many Latino persons have two *last* names. While the two surname system is definitely the norm in Spanish speaking countries, some Latino Americans and immigrants may sometimes drop one to conform to the U.S. system. The first is the name of one's father, and that is the principal name. The second is the mother's last name. Non-Latino persons in the United States often wrongly presume that the last one is the primary surname and this can cause problems. Blumberg and Goerman provide the following hypothetical example:

> A man named Juan Rodriguez Perales considers himself to be Mr. Rodriguez. When a woman marries, she usually does not change her name and continues to use her father's name. If Ana Garcia Fernandez married Juan Rodriguez Perales, she becomes Ana Garcia (Fernandez) de Rodriguez, but still uses Garcia as her primary surname. Some married women might continue to use both their father's and mother's surnames. Their child would be named Miguel Rodriguez Garcia.

With these Latino naming customs, the father, mother, and child in the same household may have different surnames from each other. The census form has room for just one surname for each person. This lack of adequate space to record full names can lead to confusion and difficulty for Latino immigrants in responding to the census; some women may give their father's name, while others may follow American conventions and use their husband's primary surname, and others might not complete the form at all.[28] Inconsistency in presenting mother's, father's, and/or a woman's married name was also mentioned by Chavira-Prado (2001). She recommends that the Census Bureau pay special attention to social and cultural variations in the order and use of last names. Inconsistency in recording father's or husband's surname for married women and inconsistencies in listing one or two surnames over time can also complicate, and perhaps bias,

---

[28]When the issue of inadequate space on the census form to record full Latino names (especially for married women) was brought up in a meeting by the author, Violeta Vazquez, a colleague closely involved in improving enumeration of Latinos and other special populations in the Decennial Management Division, herself a Latina, nodded agreement with the issue.

later evaluations of census coverage of Latinos[29] and other groups with differing naming conventions.

Blumberg and Goerman suggest that two name fields for name be provided on future Spanish language forms. They suggest that research be done on how best to designate extra name fields for Latinos without confusing non-Latinos. They also suggest research be done on adding a third field so that married Latino women can record their husband's surname, preceded by "de."

4.1.3.4. Cultural Issues in Deciding Who Should be Person One on the Census Form

In several cases, Latino respondents did not follow our rules for determining who should be listed as Person One.

Household 119 The respondent lives in a trailer with ten other men. He made several mistakes in rostering. First, he listed the owner of the trailer as Person One, but this is wrong because the owner does not live in the trailer. Next, he listed the same person as Person Two on the form, causing duplication. Third, he listed other people in the trailer, but did not list himself, and fourth, he didn't list person nine, who moved in 20 days ago, saying afterward, "I can't put him on the form because I don't know his name or surname."

This is the kind of ad hoc household described by Montoya (1992) in his 1990 ethnographic evaluation of migrant labor quarters. Some of the men in this household have done migrant labor work in the past while others are still doing it now. All but two of them leave the area to find work during the year. According to the respondent, "Many come and go. If there's room here they can come back but we always have new people coming here." "Sometimes people stay here while looking for a new place." Typically there are many men in the house but they change. Goerman notes that word must be out on the grapevine of this place to stay, for new men come here, looking for a place. Sometimes they are acquaintances and sometimes they are from the same country. The respondent says, "I'll always come and go...I'd like to work here and return a lot to Mexico."

This case highlights four problems; respondents with limited literacy may misinterpret question 3 as asking just for the name of the owner or renter, not perceiving that the person should also live in this household to be designated as Person One. We will encounter the same problem with two respondents in our Korean study group. This problem creates erroneous enumerations.

---

[29] Census coverage evaluations rely on matching the names and addresses of specific persons in the census to those included in a later coverage survey. If the last names of persons in the two data collections are not the same and there is not enough demographic information to match the persons across data collections conclusively, they may not be included in the calculation of coverage.

The second issue is that the respondent also was not accustomed to completing forms and ended up listing the landlord as both Person One and Person Two on his mock census form during the ethnographic interview. Had this been a real census, this landlord might have been triple counted. Counting the landlord twice when he shouldn't have been counted at all, and the omission of both the respondent and Person nine throw off the number of persons living in this household at the time of the ethnographic interview; it should be eight, not ten.

The third observation is that in some types of very fluid, nonrelative households, with people on different schedules and always coming and going, one person may not know how many people are staying there on a specific day, and may not be able to provide basic information on every person, such as name in this case, or demographics. This type of household may be common among migrant workers and may produce undercounting and errors in demographic characteristics.

The fourth important point about this household is that the household type would change dramatically, if one of five other men had been the respondent, because of the method of reckoning relationships to Person One only. Because the landlord was not related to anyone, this would be classified as a male householder non-family household. However, exploration of interrelationships among the residents revealed two sets of relatives: one group of three brothers and another group of two brothers. Had any of these men been designated as Person One, this household would have been classified as a male householder family household. The other three men are not related to anyone else in the household.

The most interesting observation is that the true complexity of this household is impossible to capture by reckoning relationships to Person One, no matter which of the eight residents is identified as Person One. The best reading we could get would be to identify the group of three brothers by having one of them as Person One. However, the other set of two brothers would not be identified, because they would both be nonrelatives of Person One and their siblingship would be masked. We would not be able to learn that the other three men were unrelated to anyone in the household.

Other factors that may bias the choice of who is listed as Person One on census forms are differing cultural beliefs and experiences about who should be considered to be the head of the household, in the sense of being economically central.

Household 102 A Latino woman lists four persons as living in a trailer: two women and two men. The other woman has lived in the trailer the longest, and is in fact the owner of it. That woman's boyfriend, Alfredo, just moved in a few weeks ago. He doesn't have a job and has not yet contributed any money for his share of the bills. This woman respondent designated Alfredo as Person One. In Goerman's view, the choice of this man as Person One can only be explained by a cultural bias toward listing men first; he is a tenuous member at best.

Household 103 A Latino grandmother identifies a total of 12 people in her household: her six children, a son-in-law, and four grandchildren. She and her daughters choose her 23 year old son as Person One, possibly because he is one of the two persons in the household who are earning money. This household is thus classified as a male householder family household. Goerman thinks there is a possibility that the grandmother should have chosen herself as Person One and the household should have been classified as a female householder multigenerational household, but Goerman did not collect information on who owned or rented the house, so she can't be sure.

Blumberg and Goerman cite these examples as indications that the patriarchal bias in Latino cultures persists, although it is tapering off. In focus groups with men not included in Goerman's sample, the men told Blumberg that it is culture and past experience that cause the tendency of some Latinos to list a male (almost any male) as a household head. Most Latin American census forms have instructions that either directly or indirectly ask that a male be designated as the head of household. The researchers suggest that question 3 be revised to give better instructions on who should be chosen as Person One.

It was not so long ago (1970) that the same instruction to choose a male as household head was included on U.S. census forms, perhaps because males were regarded by many persons in the post-World War II era as the family breadwinner. At the urging of women's groups, the Census Bureau abandoned the practice of designating men as household heads for the 1980 census. Since then, respondents are asked to list as Person One, "someone living here who owns, is buying or rents this house, apartment or mobile home. If there is no such person, start with any adult living or staying here." Person One is now officially called the "householder." According to a conversation several years ago with Martin O'Connell, chief of the Fertility and Family Branch in the Population Division, there had been a steady increase in the incidence of women being listed as Person One, but this is linked to whether a couple is designated as married or not. According to Census 2000 data, among married couple households, 12.9 percent of the households had a woman listed as Person One, compared to a much higher 46.4 percent of opposite-sex unmarried partner households (Simmons and O'Connell 2003).

Thus low literacy, lack of familiarity with official U.S. forms, differing cultural beliefs and experiences with completing census forms in Latin American countries are some of the factors identified in this study of Latinos that may bias who is designated as Person One.

4.1.3.5. Mobility in and out of Households and Who is Considered a Household Member

Seven of the Latino households had changes in number of residents between April 1 and the time they were interviewed in this study (May 8 to June 12, 2000). Three households had one person move in; one household had one move in and one move out; two had two persons move in; and one had five persons move in.

In one case it was not clear whether an absent person should be listed or not:

Household 108 The respondent listed her husband, his two brothers and a nephew along with her children. In probing to identify other possible members, a third brother of the husband was identified. He is a recurrent transnational migrant who often lives here for extended periods, then returns to Mexico for awhile, and comes back. He's been gone since December and he had planned to return in May or June of 2000. He'll stay about two years, then go back to Mexico again. Should this man be counted in this household? He wasn't in this country on Census Day, so the answer is probably no. The two brothers also travel back and forth and happened to be in the household at the time of the interview and the census, so they were counted there. Had the enumeration been done at another time, one or both of these men may have gone back to Mexico temporarily and not been counted here.

In household 104, the respondent didn't list her sister-in-law and that woman's husband on the mock census form. In probing, Goerman learned that this couple started living in this household in January and sleep every night in this household. This couple plans to move to a small house in the United States, but save to move back to Mexico in the future. According to the respondent, "I didn't know if I should put them on the form, because they haven't lived here long and it's not a permanent situation." This is reminiscent of the Navajo cases where persons living in the household were not included on the census form because their situation was deemed temporary and they had taken the first steps toward building their house.

4.1.3.6. Permanence of complex households

Among many Latino immigrant respondents, complex households are a temporary adaptation. According to Goerman, among all of her 67 respondents in both the original and followup studies, three quarters said they didn't anticipate living with their current coresidents permanently. In many cases, her respondents were in this country temporarily and aimed to return to their home countries and establish family households there. Others who wanted to stay in this country were living in complex households in order to save money and get established. The majority of both groups–those in complex households and those in nuclear families–prefer either nuclear or extended family living arrangements over living with nonrelatives. The first preference is to live in nuclear family households.

In summary, a number of factors affecting household type, relationships, and accurate census counting were identified as a result of the Latino ethnographic study: 1) definition of a household when unrelated families double up in a housing unit for economic reasons but maintain "separateness"; 2) language issues involving attempts to translate basic concepts such as household (*hogar*), stay (*quedarse*), spouse (*esposo/esposa*), and foster child (*hijo de crianza*) without prior pretesting to assess the degree of functional equivalence between English and Spanish; 3) differing cultural naming practices that cannot be accommodated due to insufficient space for more than one name on the questionnaire; 4) cultural factors influencing the decision as

to who should be listed as Person One that don't match our instructions; and 5) cyclic mobility between the home country and the United States leading to ambiguities in household membership in the research site. The case study of the household with two pairs of siblings and three unrelated men shows that no matter which of the eight men is designated as Person One, the true complexity of this household is masked because relationships are reckoned to Person One only.

Several recommendations are offered as a result of this Latino ethnographic study. First, the Census Bureau's new programs on translation issues and pretesting of foreign language forms are very important and should be expanded. Carrasco and Musquiz and Yuling Pan (our new sociolinguist) are doing groundbreaking research with new insights that are very useful for improving the enumeration of linguistically isolated households in this country. We recommend some exploration of whether additional space on the census form can be allocated for names to accommodate Latino naming customs. We also recommend new exploratory research on Latino immigrants concerning cultural factors influencing who is designated as Person One, the relationships between intent to stay permanently or cycle between the home country and the United States and whether one is considered to be a household member or not, and other factors.

4.1.4 Korean Complex Households

Tai Kang conducted his ethnographic research with Koreans in Queens, New York among mostly low-income Korean immigrants (Kang 2000a, 2000b, forthcoming). He didn't ask whether these immigrants were in the country illegally or not, but suspects that some of them were. The particular area of Queens where he did his research has a high proportion of Koreans and other Asians. Many of his respondents live in buildings with Koreans and other Asians, work for Korean businesses, attend Korean churches, read Korean papers, and shop at Korean stores. Some have very little interaction with non-Koreans, despite living in a U.S. city.

Among the ethnographers on this project, Kang had the most difficulty in finding respondents willing to be interviewed for this study. Kang himself is Korean, is a university professor, and is at an age that commands respect. He had done research in this community in the past on his own and for the Census Bureau (Kang 1990). As part of this complex households research, he hired six well-respected community leaders to recruit respondents and accompany him to interviews to introduce him to respondents. He had to make numerous calls and visits to convince persons to agree to be interviewed and had to be careful about probing during the interview. Three interviews he started were terminated and he was escorted to the door as a result of asking for permission to tape record the interviews. As a result, he gave up trying to tape interviews and hand-wrote his notes. He conducted the interviews in Korean and gave the respondents mock census forms in Korean to complete. He had to be elliptical in asking some questions concerning income and employment as these are sensitive topics; many people declined to give that information. In one case, he was halfway through an interview with an older woman when her daughter dropped by. The daughter terminated the interview, cursed at Kang, and came after him

with a broom! He left quickly. He notes dryly that the Census Bureau needs to do a significant amount of community outreach to convince Koreans to respond to the census.

Kang attributes the refusals and guardedness to mistrust of the government and its promises of confidentiality; privacy; fear of deportation; fear of eviction from apartments with strict limits on the number of persons who can reside in them; fear of losing social service benefits; and unwillingness to give any information about how they supplement their income in the underground economy. [30] In the words of one of his respondents:

> How we live, what we do, and who we are should not be anybody else but our own family's business. I see nothing but troubles if governments or outsiders know anything about my family. I just don't trust them.

Kang set out to find complex households of three types: three-generation families, families with nonrelated individuals, and households of nonrelated persons. He interviewed respondents in twelve three-generation families with an average of 5.6 persons each (range: four to eight); five families with non-related individuals with an average of 3.8 persons per household (range: three to six); and eight non-related person households with an average of 3.0 persons and a range of two to six persons. Twenty two were of a low or lower low economic level and three were middle class.

4.1.4.1. Definition of "household"

All but one of his respondents defined "household" as a family: members of a family residing in the same housing unit. When asked about coresident nonrelatives, the answer was, "They live with us, however, they are not the members of our household."

In one case, the respondent's household extended beyond their apartment:

Household 519 A man, his wife, their son, his wife's mother, and his brother-in-law (his wife's brother) are listed by the respondent as living in this two bedroom apartment. The married couple shares one bedroom and the grandmother and grandson share the other. On probing about the brother-in-law, the respondent (his wife's mother) says, "My younger son rents a room in a neighbor's apartment. He just sleeps in the rented room. He spends most of his time with the family, watches Korean TV programs, and has all of his meals with us. He is a member of our family and he is a member of our household. That is why he's included in the census." Kang

[30] Mistrust of the government, fear of eviction and of deportation and of losing social benefits were also noted as undercounting issues in the Latino and the African American studies.

points out that this brother-in-law lives in another housing unit and should not have been listed on this census form.[31]

In another case, a 23 year old respondent said that in the actual census, she listed herself and her grandmother. She did not list a nonrelated elderly woman who shares the apartment because "She is not a member of our family. She (the housemate) said she filled out the form at her church." Kang doubts this nonrelated woman responded to the census.

4.1.4.2. "Social face" and social desirability

Kang tells us that there are two aspects of Korean culture which may have an impact on the accuracy and quality of data collected from Korean households.

> In Korean culture, as in many other Asian cultures, "presenting and maintaining a culturally respectable *self"* is an important aspect of social interaction. Koreans are extremely reluctant to reveal or show outsiders personal or family related matters that could degrade ones' "*social face*." (Kang 2000: 17)

He says that Koreans are reluctant to reveal their job or work if it is considered "less than desirable," their financial status, and less than desirable living conditions. Some Koreans may embellish their education and occupation and under-report income. Were it not for the entré provided by the community liaison who accompanied him, Kang said he would not have had access to many of these households with so many people living in small spaces. He suspects, but is not sure, that saving face may have been an explanation why two of the people living in one house refused to have their names included on the actual census form for this household.

Household 502 Six nonrelated women live together in a two bedroom apartment. Three of the women are in their thirties to fifties and are divorced, while the other three are younger women just starting out. Two of these women go to the same church and obtained a census form there and a minister helped them fill it out. The other four women refused to be included on the form. Kang suspects that the younger women refused because they were on student visas but working and did not want to go back to Korea so they might have been stretching out their classes to maintain their visa status. He surmises that the other two women may not have wanted to be included on the form because they had less desirable occupations–masseuse and beautician–that they did not want to reveal.

Cohabitation is another area where Koreans save "social face." In case 503, the male respondent listed two people: himself and a woman, whom he marked as a "roommate" on the mock census form. He said he'd done the same on the actual census form. Knowing that in Korean culture,

---

[31] Sung also found members of neighbor's Chinese families renting rooms in New York's Chinatown (Sung 1991).

unmarried partners don't publicly acknowledge that they are cohabiting, Kang lightly and jokingly asked the man, "How long could a healthy robust widower and an attractive widow stay uninvolved in an efficiency apartment?" The man smiled and said, "The relationship between us has a sign of changing" and laughed. Kang interpreted this to mean that the relationship here was unmarried couple, not roommate, but the respondent would not mark that on the census form. Given this reluctance to admit cohabitation, it is likely that the number of Korean cohabiting couples identified in censuses and surveys may be lower than it should be.

Social desirability–saying what you think others may want to hear–is an important part of Korean social etiquette, according to Kang. All of his respondents told him they had completed and submitted their actual Census 2000 forms. In his view, it would be difficult for a respondent to tell him they had not submitted a form when there was a very visible "census awareness" campaign in the community; he was skeptical that they were telling him the truth.

4.1.4.3. Mobility

Only one Korean household had a change in its household composition between April 1, 2000 and the interview day in June or July.

4.1.4.4. Cultural differences in use of relationship terms

According to Kang, "foster child" was a term that was not understood by Korean respondents. The foster care system is a cultural institution that is not known in Korea, and a number of the respondents don't know about the foster care system in this country. They asked Kang what it meant.

"Adopted child" is problematic for the same reason. Adoption in Korea is rare, and if it occurs, it involves a member of the family. Adopted and step relationships are rarely revealed to outsiders. They would simply be called "children."

According to Kang, Koreans in the United States have maintained some cultural traditions from Korea.

> Use of relationship terms in speech reflects the patrilineal, patrilocal, and vertical hierarchical structure of family relationships. [Koreans] further differentiate relationship terms between the paternal and maternal side...Birth order within the same family rank is also clearly separated. (Kang 2000: 15).

He says that it is mostly older people in their sixties and over who make these distinctions. Younger people are less likely to follow this tradition.

4.1.4.5. Person One

Two elderly Korean respondents made the same mistake in deciding whom to list as Person One. In one case, the respondent listed her adult daughter as Person One because the apartment was rented in her name. This daughter did not live in the apartment; she lived with her own nuclear family in another house. The second case was identical, except that the person in whose name the apartment was rented was the son of the respondent.

As a result of this mistake, household composition is altered: rather than being classified as married couple households, one was designated as a male householder family. In the other, household composition remained the same as a female householder nonfamily household, but the age of the new householder changed from that of a young woman to that of her mother. Kang said the cause of this is convoluted language in question 3 on whom to designate as Person One that is not fully understood by people whose native language is not English.

4.1.4.6. Reasons for Living in Complex Households

Twenty one of his households had a low or lower low standard of living. All of the families with nonrelated individuals and seven of the eight nonfamily households fell into this category. For these households, the main reason for living in a complex household is economic. Kang notes that rapidly increasing real estate prices force new immigrants to compete for a limited number of low rent apartments and they often have to take in additional people to share the rent.

Household 516 A middle-aged woman who works in a nail salon shares her one-bedroom apartment with another woman who works in a beauty parlor and a young college student. The respondent gave the bedroom to the college student because she needs a quiet place to study. The respondent and the other woman sleep on beds in the living room. In her words,

> One bedroom apartments around here go for about $1000 a month. It is very difficult to pay that much money for a person who works in a nail salon. So I put a "housemate wanted" ad in a local ethnic newspaper whenever I have to have new housemates. We have to have three people here. Otherwise I cannot afford to keep the apartment." (In Kang 2000: 16).

This respondent sent in her census form with herself and the older woman listed. The college student refused to have her name listed on the census form.

Nine of the twelve three-generation families also had bed(s) in their living rooms because there were too few bedrooms in the apartments.

Household 512 An older man lives in a two bedroom apartment with his wife, daughter, son, daughter-in-law, and their grandchild. The son and his wife have one bedroom and the daughter

has the other. The respondent, his wife, and grandchild sleep on beds in the living room. The respondent, his son and his daughter all have jobs and his wife takes in children, babysitting for pay. By pooling their income and sharing the costs of bills they make enough money to get by.

In a number of households, the husband and wife arranged to bring one of their mothers from Korea to live with them. The grandmother typically watches the children and takes care of chores so that the husband and wife can go out to work. According to Kang, the wife's mother is more often chosen to come over than the husband's mother in order to avoid culturally traditional conflicts between mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law; the Koreans in his sample did not want conflict.

The most salient factor affecting household type, relationships, and the accuracy of the count identified in the Korean ethnographic study revolves around widespread mistrust of the government and its pledges of confidentiality and propensity to either not respond or to omit people or information due to fears of deportation, eviction, losing social service benefits, or revealing income from the underground economy. Kang notes that recruiting and conducting successful interviews was much more difficult in 2000 than it had been in the same community in 1990 and he cautioned the Census Bureau in his 2000 project report that much more work needs to be done on community research for the 2010 census.

This should be of immediate and particular concern for two reasons. First, Kang's study of Koreans was done in Queens, New York and his findings suggest extra outreach needs to be conducted toward Koreans and other Asians for the 2004 Census test that will be conducted in this same area. Second, Kang wrote his report before the September 11th terrorist attacks and there is much more attention now on identifying illegal immigrants. It is likely we may encounter even higher nonresponse and omissions among Korean and other immigrants due to increased fears of deportation; special outreach efforts with recognized Korean community leaders should be carefully planned.

Other factors identified in this study include 1) a family-centered definition of household that may lead to the omission of nonrelated persons living in the household; 2) the refusal of unrelated persons to be listed on a household form; 3) reluctance to mark unmarried partner because cohabitation is not considered acceptable among Koreans; 4) unfamiliarity with the meaning of the categories of foster child and adopted child, because such legal institutions do not exist in Korea; and 5) literal, rather than functionally equivalent translations of concepts such as "roommate."

Recommendations stemming from this Korean study revolve around intensive development of outreach programs to Koreans through churches and other social institutions to overcome growing resistance to participation and mistrust of confidentiality; placing definitions of foster child and adopted child on the form for respondents unfamiliar with these concepts; and sociolinguistic research to improve the translation of the form.

4.1.5 Rural White Complex Households

Sharon Hewner, an anthropologist with a nursing background and an interest in gerontology, conducted research with rural non-Hispanic whites in six western New York counties in May and June of 2000 (Hewner 2000a, 2000b). She asked people in her field area to identify complex households. Although Hewner is white herself, she described going into a restaurant in her rural research area and finding local people staring at her because she was clearly an outsider. She realized that the clothing she was wearing for interviewing marked her as coming from an unfamiliar world. She worked hard to dispel this image in subsequent visits and was able to establish rapport with her respondents.

She describes her research area as a place where the traditional agricultural way of life is disappearing. Younger people are increasingly leaving the area and those who stay are taking regular jobs, changing the way of life. There are fewer people available to take care of the increasingly older residents.

Hewner suggests that one reason rural New York whites are forming complex households with others–boarders, cohabitors, children, grandchildren, neighbors, siblings or friends–is to assist in providing care and essential services, such as snow shoveling, and/or being a companion. This is a new factor that may lead to the formation of complex households that has not been identified in previous research.

As a result of her background in nursing, Hewner identified a unique type of blended household that is formed to provide supervision and/or assistance for frail elderly persons. She conducted interviews in several of these households. One case is especially interesting and poses some fundamental questions about our residence rules:

Household 416 About six months before the interview, the elderly man in this household fell and hurt himself. His grandson moved into the house to assist him, while his mother and younger brother continued to live in their own house around the corner with the pets. Several weeks later it was clear that the man was deteriorating, so this boy's mother and brother joined him in staying at his grandfather's house. Over the last five months or so, the three of them have been living out of suitcases at this relative's house and return to their own house three or more times a day to take care of their pets. At the time of the census, it was not clear whether the man would recover enough to live independently again; at the time of the interview it is clear that he won't. Who should have been listed on the census form for the man's household: all four of them, just the man and his grandson, or just the man? Which is the more correct place of enumeration for the woman and her sons either on census day or on the interview day: the house of her father where she spends most of the day and night and lives out of suitcases, or her own house where she has lived until recently, where she has her pets and belongings, and continues to receive her mail? Who should be listed on this census form on the interview date and who, if anyone, should be counted in their home around the corner? This is not an easy case to resolve. The household type would vary, depending on the decision about who should be counted there: it

could be a male householder nonfamily household if only the father is counted, or it could be a male householder three-generation family household if his daughter and grandson are counted there.

Do these three people live or stay at the man's house? Hewner describes a similar case (413) in which a woman moves into her parent's house across the street for caregiving and allows her son to stay in her own house. In both of these cases, the caregivers have moved temporarily to a relative's house but kept their own residence. When asked if they expected this situation to continue for six months, respondents could not answer because the situation was in flux. Hewner says there is a problem with the scope of time in these "merged households;" most of them are prepared to stay with the person for awhile, for perhaps a few years, but they don't relinquish their own households. In cases such as this, the concept of "stay" to denote temporariness is stretched to a much longer period of time than might be expected in other situations.

This situation is somewhat analogous to two vignettes previously described. The first is in household 614, where the Navajo woman and children who lived with her parents and sibling in one hogan were not considered to be part of that household and were left off the census form. One of the reasons the respondent gave for omitting her daughter's family was that they would eventually move into their own place next door, once approvals were received to construct that house. The second was in household 104 where the Latina didn't list her brother-in-law and sister on the census form because they moved in temporarily to save money and plan to eventually return to Mexico to build their own house. In all of these cases, the current living situation is viewed as temporary and there is an intention to change that living situation at some time in the future, or at least keep the option open to change the situation, as in Hewner's caregiver cases, so people staying thee for an extended but temporary period were not included on the census form.

Perhaps the perception of a living situation as temporary and the intention to move are critical factors in deciding where people should count themselves or others in the census and they may ignore our rules instructing them to do otherwise. More than a decade ago, Gerber (1990) identified intention to move as a factor in the determination of residence among poor African Americans. There is also a large literature on settlers versus sojourners in migration.

Hewner identifies another interesting case of a woman who rents rooms to elderly women who need care.

Household 410 The respondent is a widowed woman who cares for old women on a temporary or somewhat more permanent basis. She describes this as private home health care or an adult foster home, not a group home. Five women currently live in her house: three boarders and two temporary roomers who are 80+ years old. One of the roomers came here temporarily from her granddaughter's house where she usually lives because her granddaughter was close to giving birth and couldn't care for her. The baby has come and the respondent thinks this elderly woman will move out soon. One woman who had been living here died in March, before the census, and

another moved in. Hewner and the respondent agree that her relationship with these women is much stronger than the relationship terms she uses for them: boarder and roomer.

Hewner suggests that we add a new relationship category to the census form to identify caregivers. It seems there may be a need for a new category, because research has shown that some persons mark the foster child category for an adult. According to Martin O'Connell (personal communication) about 10-15 percent of the persons marked as "foster children" in the relationship question are age 18 and above. Perhaps people are marking "foster child" because there is no category for "custodial care." The author has been working on a project with Jennifer Hunter, conducting semi-structured research to explore the possibility of adding a new relationship category for persons receiving custodial care. The results of this study are documented in a new report (Hunter, Schwede, and Aaker 2003).

4.1.5.1. Unmarried Partner, Common Law Partner, and Husband/Wife

Hewner had nine households with unmarried partners and notes that there is a lot of inconsistency in how they record their relationships on the census form. "Unmarried partner" (the category intended to pick up people living together without being married) was marked by only four of the nine white respondents. The categories chosen by the other five respondents were spouse (1), roomer/boarder (1), other relative, with a write-in for girlfriend (1), and other nonrelative (once for a person the respondent called a fiancé, and once for a gay live-in partner).

Part of the reason that there is such inconsistency in how unmarried couples are recorded in the census is that there is still social stigma in this society concerning couples living together without being married, especially for elderly people. This is very likely the reason one elderly respondent in a pilot interview reacted strongly when she saw the relationship question and its categories:

> I don't think it's fair that the government either makes us be liars or criminals.

Hewner explains that this woman is referring to her partner and herself, who were previously married to other people, and are now widowed or divorced. They are living together as husband and wife, but can't use that category because they aren't legally married. If they refuse to complete the form so they don't have to lie about their relationship, they are then criminals, the respondent thinks, based on the statement on the front of the envelope that it is required by law that they complete and send in the form.

Hewner reports that it was difficult for respondents to find terms for their live-in partner that they felt comfortable with. Many thought of their partner as a husband or wife and said they found terms such as roomer, girlfriend, or fiancé belittling.

She notes that there is no consistency on what a common law husband/wife should be called. Some of the common law marriages in her households had been stable for 30 years or more. She found no consensus on whether common law partners should be considered relatives, rather than nonrelatives. Blumberg makes the same case for Latino common law marriages which are very prevalent in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Both Hewner and Blumberg argue that common law marriages are more permanent and more like formal marriages, while unmarried partnerships are ephemeral and more likely to dissolve in a short time. Blumberg suggests, and Hewner would probably agree, that a new common law category should be added to the census form in the relative column, just below husband/wife.

This raises interesting questions. How are households with common law partners classified by the Census Bureau in terms of household type: as married couple family households or as non-family households?

According to the Census 2000 Technical Documentation (U.S. Census Bureau 2002: B-10):

> Spouse (husband/wife). Includes a person married to and living with a householder. This category includes people in formal marriages, as well as people in common law marriages. The number of spouses is equal to the number of "married couple families" or "married-couple households" in 100-percent tabulations. Marital status categories cannot be inferred from the 100-percent tabulations since the marital status item was not included on the 100-percent form.

While the official definition says that households with common law partners are classified as married couple families, the category, "common law partner," is never identified in the relationship question or response categories.[32]

This raises another question. What is the difference between a common law partner and an unmarried partner? Returning to the Census 2000 Technical Documentation we find the following on page B-11:

> Unmarried partner. A person who is not related to the householder, who shares living quarters, and who has a close personal relationship with the householder.

There is no official definition of common-law partner, so we can't definitively answer the question of how a common-law partner differs from an unmarried partner. Thus, our official Census Bureau definitions of "spouse" and "married couple households" are not operationalized

---

[32] There may be significant variation in the legal definitions of "common law marriage" among states that recognize this type of marriage. Research would be needed on differences in legal definitions as part of any future Census Bureau attempts to develop a standardized definition.

property in the relationship question on the census form. If the Census Bureau does not define the difference, how can we expect respondents to do it in a consistent manner? To what extent are our distributions of married couple households and non-couple households distorted by the lack of a common-law partner category or definition on the form when common-law partner is included in our official definition of a married couple family? And what are the policy implications of distortions in the relative proportions of female householder families, male householder families and married couples?

4.1.5.2. Relationships of Children with Adults:

In addition to the lack of respondent consistency on a relationship term for unmarried partners, there is an inconsistency in what relationship terms should be used between a child and his parent's unmarried partner. Currently, there is no term on the census form for this unique relationship. Technically, the child of one's unmarried partner is a nonrelative, but seven of Hewner's 25 respondents felt that if the unmarried partner is living with the child and acting as a parent, the child should be called that partner's stepchild or child, rather than a nonrelative.[33] In only one of these white cases was the non-parental adult listed as Person One, so we have only the one case to observe how this relationship to unmarried partner's child was marked on the form; in this case it was done correctly, with the child marked as a nonrelative. We might want to keep this in mind in later research, looking for cases of unmarried couples with coresident children, to see how often the child is listed as the child, stepchild, or adopted child of the nonparental adult.

Hewner notes that in common law marriages, the partner is often defined as a relative or as family. In seven rural white households, she found that the children from a previous marriage or relationship are usually called stepchildren to the unmarried partner. Whether respondents would actually mark this on a census form is not known. This was found among the Latino sample as well.

This is one example of a fictive relationship - considering a nonrelated person to be part of the family with some kin role.

We recommend adding a new nonrelative category to the census form: unmarried partner's child. Cognitive testing will reveal how this category is perceived and used by respondents.

---

[33] Bumpass, Raley, and Sweet (1995) argue for a broadening of the definition of stepfamilies to include cohabitation with a child of just one partner, and include those formed after nonmarital childbearing and after marital disruption. One quarter of unmarried mothers are living with the child's father at the time of birth (Bumpass and Raley 1995).

4.1.5.3. Relationship of Adopted, Step and Other Children to Parent

There were nine rural white households with adopted children. Respondents were reluctant to mark the category of "adopted child." There is a consensus that a legally adopted child is the same as a biological child. In Hewner's view, adopted child should be included in the same response category as a biological child, rather than in a separate category as is currently done. All of the adopted parents referred to biological and adopted children in the same way.

One additional situation that needs attention is what relationship should be marked for the child of an adopted child. Two of Hewner's respondents just referred to such a child as a grandchild, while others called the child of an adopted child the same thing: adopted child. This latter strategy masks the three generational nature of these relationships. This situation, though somewhat rare, was identified in project interviews with some white households as well as Navajo households.

Hewner went on to say that when respondents were asked to define "son" and "daughter" they included adopted foster, step, and fictive children, children-in-law and biological children. She feels we should have one category for children, not have separate categories. Tongue pointed out that Navajos would never on their own identify children as part of one of these subgroups; they are all loved and considered to be their children.

The drawback, however, is that lumping adopted, step, and biological children into one category is going backward to methods used in the 1980s. This would reduce the precision of relationship categories and household types at the very time that relationships and household types are diversifying as a result of increasing immigration; increasing rates of divorce, remarriage, and blending of families; increasing numbers of grandparent-maintained and other multigenerational living arrangements, and other demographic factors. The author think the specific categories for children should be retained because of the detail they provide on changing household composition.

4.1.5.4. Fictive Kin

Above, we identified one type of fictive kin: children of a previous spouse who are considered to be and designated as the stepchildren of the current unmarried partner. In another case, a number of years ago, the respondent and her husband informally adopted the unwanted baby of an unrelated teenager, had their own names put on her birth certificate as biological parents, and raised her in an informal adoption. They call her their daughter, even though she is not related to them by blood or marriage. An adult now, she moved out of their house, had a child, and acted very irresponsibly. When the state threatened to take the child from his mother and place him in foster care, the respondent and her husband went to court to get custody. She said they are his "court appointed guardians." We don't have a relationship category for "court appointed

guardian." On the census form, the respondent marks this boy as her grandchild; he is really a nonrelative. There were cases of legal guardians among the African American households too.[34]

Hewner goes on to identify several other types of fictive kin: adopted fictive kin, divorced affinal relatives (those based on the previous marriage), and divorced consanguineal relatives, by which she means relatives who are no longer considered to be relatives because of nonperformance of roles or some type of falling out.

We don't know of any research on the extent to which respondents list nonrelatives as relatives on the census form. This might be an interesting topic to explore.

4.1.5.5. Definition of Household

There is no clear consensus among the rural white respondents on the meaning of "household." The closest definition, according to Hewner, is that household means a family unit. It is not a place where you live and stay. Hewner found that boarders who used the same door as household members were viewed as household members while renters using a separate entrance were not.

4.1.5.6. Reasons for Living in a Complex Household

According to Hewner,

> Complex households in this population were formed for both functional and economic purposes. Respondents often formed complex households for companionship and to pool economic resources. Often complex households were formed to assist someone who was not able to manage on their own. This included frail elders, children in need of adoption or foster care, and age peers who were ill. (Hewner 2000a: 32).

She identified three themes in the reasons respondents of these gave for living in a complex household.
In eight households, someone else needed it. In some cases, complex households were formed to assist a child or grandchild, and in others, temporary complex households were formed to

---

[34] Ackerman (2002: 11) notes that Colville Indian women between the ages of 25 and 40 who establish stable residences to raise their children may also take in more distant relatives as well as unrelated children. "The adoption of unrelated children is so common that a term referring to them is used on at least three reservations. They are called 'take ins.'" It would be interesting to learn what relationship category Colville Indians mark for these unrelated children they take in.

provide care for an older person. In eight cases, the respondent chose to form a complex household, and in eight other cases, it just happened.

4.1.5.7.Mobility in and out of Households since Census Day

According to Hewner's report, 16 households had some movement of members between households and/or facilities between April 1, 2000 and their interview date four to ten weeks later. Of these, two households had permanent moves out. The fiancé moved into household 419 and a mother moved permanently to an assisted living facility.

In twelve households, persons cyclically moved in or out. In two of these households, husband and wife snowbirds returned to their New York homes. In eight other homes, children moved between shared households. According to Hewner, the custody arrangements of these children were very clear so in most cases, there was no problem deciding where they should be counted.

In two households, a college student returned home for the summer. The respondent in household 415 was confused about whether this college student should be listed as residing in this household on the interview day in May when the college student was not supposed to be listed in this household:

> I know when we did it [the actual census form] we didn't include college children. Do you want me to include her–she's home now, but she was away at college during the school year. All right, she's here today if you don't want me to go by April 1.[35]

There was one additional household with a person on a cyclical pattern of movement.

Household 407 The respondent's husband is an over-the-road truck driver on a weekly cycle. During the week, he sleeps in the cab of his truck, but returns to his house to sleep on the weekend.

According to our residence rules for mobile persons, people who cycle weekly between residences are to be counted in the place where they spend the most nights, for apportionment purposes. In this case, the man sleeps in his truck but parks it in different places each night. The residence rule that applies in this case is "Person lives in this household but is temporarily absent

---

[35] This respondent raises an interesting point. If the enumeration of a household is conducted during the summer vacation when college students are home from college, should the college student be listed on the household census form or not? Since we start conducting our census coverage evaluations in July, are some of the erroneous enumerations of college students possibly the result of doing interviews when college students who were living away at the time of the census are back home for the summer?

on Census Day on a visit, business trip, vacation or in connection with a job (e.g. bus driver, traveling salesperson, boat operator)."

The third category of movers involves those who move out for unknown durations. Three households fall into this category: one household already counted above and two others. In one, two temporary boarders moved into household 410, but they will be returning to their regular residences soon. In another, two young adults moved out - one to move in with grandparents to provide care and the other to move into his own apartment. In the last of these households, one person left to take a job in a distant state. His residence is currently ambiguous:

Household 425 The respondent and her husband allowed their adult son, his wife, and his child to move into their large house in New York two years ago to help him out because he was having financial difficulties. Last August he moved to a distant state for employment purposes. His wife and child continued to live in this house during the time the respondent and her husband were living in the south for the winter. The plan had been for the son's wife and child to go join him in the distant state after he had settled in. The respondent and husband would like their son's wife to move out now that their son is settled, but the daughter-in-law has made no plans to move. The respondent says that her son sends money back to his wife and calls every day to talk to his wife and child, but as of now, there are no plans for him to move back here. Hewner concludes that this man is part of the household emotionally and financially, but he's been gone for more than half of the year. The respondent sums it up nicely:

> His status as a household member working elsewhere is hard to classify. He is emotionally like a long-distance trucker - very much part of the household from a distance.

This is a very interesting case from the standpoint of household type and economic status. As of Census Day, the only people physically living in the house were the daughter-in-law and her child. This would have been classified as a female householder family household and it would appear this woman was independently supporting her child in a large, expensive house. We would have no indication that this woman is married and receiving money for expenses from a spouse, because he is living in another state and hence is not listed on the form, and we do not ask marital status on the short form. We also would have no indication that this woman is being subsidized by her parents-in-law, who own the house and pay almost all of the bills, with only a nominal monthly payment from this woman. Several months later, at the time of the interview, the owners of the house return and complete the mock census form. Now the household type appears to be married couple family of three generations, but they don't function as such. The married couple stays downstairs while the daughter-in-law and grandchild stay upstairs; they cook and eat separately and rarely mix. The atmosphere is tense.

In summary, the important factors for household type and relationships and accurate enumeration in the census identified in the rural white ethnographic study include 1) lack of consistency in how cohabiting couples mark the relationship category for their coresident significant other as

husband/wife, unmarried partner or some other category; 2) lack of instructions on the census form that indicate persons in common law marriages should mark themselves as "husband/wife" rather than as unmarried partner, to be consistent with our technical definitions; 3) lack of a term on the census form for unmarried partner's child that means that some households that have a parent, his/her child, and an unmarried partner may not be identified as family households when the non-parental adult is designated as Person One on the census form; and 4) lack of a category to designate persons in one's care and/or custody, such as in the "adult foster care home" (household 410). Each of these factors could affect the accuracy of the distribution of household types in data products and reports. Other factors that may or may not affect household type include 5) "intention to move" at some point in the future may be associated with decisions about whom to include on the household roster in censuses and surveys; those who are only staying temporarily, or those whom the householder only wants to stay temporarily, may be omitted from the census form; and 6) complex households may form to provide care, essential services, and/or companionship to people who cannot manage on their own, and those who move in temporarily to provide care may or may not list themselves as household members on the census form.

Based on the results from this study we recommend qualitative and quantitative research to examine underlying assumptions that answers of "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" to the relationship question are valid and reliable indicators of marital status. We are not aware of any previous statistical studies that assess the correlations between the marital status question and these relationship categories. As a result, we recommend conducting:

> quantitative analysis with unedited Census 2000 long form data to determine the correlations between marital status and these relationship categories for different ethnic groups. At present these data are available only in state-level files and a national level file would need to be developed for this analysis;
>
> qualitative exploratory research on the meanings of marital status and associated relationship terms in different ethnic groups and how differences in the meanings and usages of these terms affect the validity of the household type variable that distinguishes "married couple" families from "other families;" and
>
> qualitative cognitive testing to compare answers persons give to standard marital and relationship survey questions with answers they give to retrospective questions designed to ascertain whether persons are formally married or not and how long they had been living together.

We also recommend the addition of a new relationship category, "unmarried partner's child," to the relationship question to more accurately reflect the number of unmarried partner households with children. One author and Jennifer hunter are conducting research on the feasibility and appropriateness of another new relationship category, along the lines of "person in custodial care," supported by the 2010 Content Research and Development Working Group.

More details on these suggestions will be provided in the concluding section.

4.1.6 African American Complex Households

Holmes and Amissah conducted ethnographic interviews in 25 complex African American households in southeastern Virginia in the spring and summer of 2002 (Holmes and Amissah 2002, Holmes forthcoming).[36] The respondents ranged from low to moderately high income. Nine of these households would be characterized as married couple households. Fourteen of the households were female householder family households and the remaining two were male householder family households.

In one of the latter two, the male respondent was living with his nephew and his roommate. In the other one, a man was living with his children in a non-complex household. The average size of the African American households ranged from two to seven, with a mean of 3.2 persons.

Within these general household types there is a great deal of diversity in the kinds of coresident relatives, such as grandparents, grandchildren, nieces, nephews, a grandnephew, children, foster children, and cousins. Six of the nine married couple households were comprised of married grandparents who were caring for grandchildren and other relatives' children or others.

Household 707. The respondent identifies six people on her mock census form: her husband, two adopted children, and her grandchildren. During the open-ended interviewing, it was learned that the two adopted children were actually her grand-nephews: her sister's two grandchildren. They have been living here since they were infants. At first they were brought here temporarily in the hope that their mother (respondent's niece) would overcome her drug problem and be able to provide a home for them, but she died. The father of one of the boys died too; there was no other family member who came forward to take them in. The respondent and her husband adopted the grand-nephews. More recently, the couple obtained legal custody of their grandchildren and are raising them because their adult child is not able to care for them. One of them is less than five years old. The husband and wife came out of retirement and returned to work so that they could support the children, but she retired again to care for them.[37]

Had we just received the completed mock census form this respondent in the mail, we would not have known if the adopted children were nonrelatives or relatives, or the exact nature of that

---

[36] This study was done with the same methods and the same core questions as the other ethnographic studies in this report, but was done two years later. This new study was done to replace the earlier African American study done in 2000 by another researcher, which had methodological issues.

[37] Tongue had a few similar cases of grandparents (informally) adopting their grandchildren when the children's parents either died or could not care for them.

relationship, or the fact that it was a skip generation relationship, and a household extended both laterally and lineally. We would also not have learned that this couple has legal custody of their grandchildren and expects them to live there for a long time. This information is needed for identifying households in poverty and accurately describing their characteristics, including whether they are grandparent-maintained households.

Household 712 The respondent listed her mother as the householder, herself, her husband, three natural-born children and one person with no relationship marked. In the open-ended discussion, Holmes learned that the respondent, her husband and children had moved into her mother's house as her mother was recuperating from an operation. This coresidence with her mother was mutually beneficial. They would provide care to the mother during the mother's convalescence and, by saving money on housing expenses, would be able to pay off very high medical expenses from a family member's illness and start to save money to buy a house. They became aware of children from a household nearby who were unsupervised for long hours. The authorities had been to that house, but the situation did not improve. Very late one evening, a young child from that neighborhood was out walking in the rain, dazed, and dressed inappropriately. The respondent and her husband took him in, cared for him, and called the authorities. The following day the judge told them that if they didn't take legal custody of the child, he would be placed in a foster home. They agreed to take legal custody, not knowing that they would be taking on full responsibility for the child without any financial help for raising him while they were still trying to pay off their medical bills. Despite this, they have welcomed this child into their family. During the interview, the respondent didn't fill in a relationship for this child on her mock census form because there was no category that fit this situation. He was not related to her, but she was raising him. Foster child just didn't fit, so she left it blank. In everyday life, she refers to him as her child, though they are not related.

In addition to these two households, Holmes had six others where an adult had legal custody of a child. Household 712 was the only one of these eight where the child in legal custody was a nonrelative; all of the other cases involved relatives: grandparents, aunts, and, in one case, a sibling, accepting legal custody for one or more children.

Holmes suggests that there are potentially large policy implications concerning children in legal custody status. What are the differences between children in legal custody, foster children, and adopted children and how do these affect the families in which this occurs? She suggests the need for research on legal custody and what this entails. She also thinks that we should consider adding the category of "legal custody" to the relationship question, but it is not clear whether respondents would be willing to mark a category for informally adopted children that might indicate there's no legal status. This would necessitate changing the instructions from marking just one relationship to marking more than one, because it is likely that most of the children in "legal custody" are relatives, rather than nonrelatives. Craver also suggested allowing respondents to mark more than one category to overcome the problem of recording a relative as an "adopted child" on a census form. The choice of adopted child masks the biological

relationship and the dynamics within the multigenerational family. We will discuss this again later.

In these two cases, African American families responded to family or neighbor crises by stepping forward and taking on the legal and social responsibility of caring for children who would otherwise have gone into the formal foster care system. Holmes says that there is a strong theme of the obligation to protect children from bad environments running through these interviews.

She also notes that the role of the extended family is critical to the social functioning of these households. While family crises of some members led to the formation of these complex households, these households reveal expectations, responsibility, role flexibility and mutual support for kin and nonkin alike.

4.1.6.1. Definition of "Household"

Holmes points out that the ideal family type in mainstream America is the nuclear family, as typified by Ozzie and Harriet and their two children on television some decades ago. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (1965) compared African American families to this ideal family type and found a lower proportion of married couple families and a concomitantly higher incidence of female-headed families. In his view, the data indicated that African American families and households were dysfunctional. Many subsequent studies perpetuated this interpretation of African American households.

Since then, there has been a paradigm shift in the social sciences in the direction of cultural relativism: examining African American families, households and networks non-judgmentally in terms of their particular characteristics and strengths, and resiliency in the face of discrimination. Carol Stack, an anthropologist, (1974) was one of the early proponents of this view.

Holmes quotes Billingsley:

> The key to understanding African American family structure is to see the whole picture with its many variations and to note its flexibility. Billingsley (1992: 45).

One of her respondents had this to say:

> A household is any group of people who have consented to live as a family. I think given a lot of what exists in African American communities that our definition of the family is not the Ozzie and Harriet mode. Our definition of family tends to mean a close, loving relationship of people who live in the same house...These relationships may or may not be biological, but at the same time there are parental and child roles...Relationships exist where people in the household are committed to taking care of each other and depending on each other

> for their survival. As a result, more and more African American families are looking like that. It is not dysfunctional in the manner that society would ascribe to the way our families are functioning. In many ways, because African American families are more than willing to take on the responsibility of other members of the family, it has a tendency to be very smoothly functioning, and it works for a lot of our families. As a result, this has become and always has been a survival technique in our community. This is one of the ways that we can ensure that our children can grow up to be productive adults and our neighbors' children become productive adults.
>
> It never has been within our culture to operate as nuclear families. My only concern is that a lot of us have gotten away from this because we have been so busy trying to pattern our families after something that is unrealistic for us... As we get back to the basics, of making sure our community survives, irrespective of who the parent might be, that is how our community will be even more stable than it already is. (in Holmes 2002: 20-21).

When Holmes and Amissah asked their respondents how they thought African American families were regarded by the white culture, almost all of the respondents in this study said that African American families are viewed negatively and stereotyped by the media. Holmes quotes one grandmother: "It seems they want to think that we are not capable of raising our families the way they are capable of raising theirs" (Holmes 2002: 22). They were also sensitive and concerned about the image of the "absentee" or "invisible" black male, Holmes reports, and wanted people in the dominant culture to learn about the importance of nephews, uncles, brothers, grandfathers, and nonrelated males in family life. The researchers report that the perceptions of African Americans of the negative views and stereotypes of their families by non-Blacks has led to mistrust and reluctance when African Americans are asked to participate in surveys, censuses and other research, and may be a source of undercounting.

In asking respondents to define "household," the researchers found that the concepts of household and family were often used interchangeably, but household could also include other relatives and close nonrelatives who were considered fictive kin. The definition of "household" that emerged from the African American respondents is conceptualized, not in terms of a specific dwelling, but rather in terms of how people live and contribute to the overall functioning of the household. There are clear expectations that individuals should share in doing chores, pooling resources, and sharing responsibilities (instrumental tasks), as well as provide emotional and psychological support (expressive contributions). As one respondent put it bluntly:

> It doesn't matter what you contribute, but you must contribute. (In Holmes 2002: 22).

The theme of survival, sharing of resources and racial identity underscores this definition across socio-economic levels, according to Holmes. It is a part of the history and culture of African Americans.

African American households are embedded in extended family and social networks. All but one of her respondents talked about the importance of these wider networks in providing support to their complex households, including financial help for single mothers. Grandmothers, aunts, sisters and close female friends provide emotional support and everyday assistance to children. Fictive kinship is extensive in the African American community.

> Several expressed this closeness by referring to their best friends as "sister" and the children referring to them as "aunt." The support of other women seems essential to making things work and managing the responsibility of their household. (Holmes 2002: 19).

There is also a strong cultural obligation among African Americans to "lift while you climb," according to Holmes. The higher African Americans move up the economic ladder, the wider the network of kin they are supposed to assist in climbing that ladder too. She offers the example of graduation ceremonies at the historically black college where she formerly taught. Many relatives attend the ceremony to celebrate with their family member being awarded the degree; the graduation is the accomplishment of both the graduate and the extended family.

4.1.6.2. Who is Person One?

In two cases, respondents listed children, instead of a householder, in the space for Person One. As a result, all relationships are reckoned from the child, rather than an adult who owns or rents the housing unit.

In household 725, the respondent listed herself as Person One, then recorded information about her nieces and a roommate. As the interview progressed it became clear that this woman should not have listed herself as Person One, because she had just moved in recently for a temporary stay and would be leaving within six months after she had straightened out her financial situation. Her niece should have been listed as Person One because the niece had lived in the apartment for a number of years and was taking care of her younger sister. When queried as to why she listed herself as Person One, the respondent said it was because she was the oldest one. Holmes' description of this woman's feelings about her situation underscores the obligations of African Americans to provide support to family members:

> Aunts provide moral and financial support to children in the family. Over the years she had been the family member who had taken in relatives and provided economic support to extended kin. The respondent characterized her current living situation as ironic. She moved in for economic reasons and felt more

comfortable living with family than with a possible unrelated roommate (Holmes interview summary).

4.1.6.3. Ambiguous Residence

In three African American households there was ambiguity about the residence status of at least one person.

Household 704 A female householder lives with her two sons and a niece. Her nephew, the niece's brother, is a young adult who is not settled and comes back and forth from another state. He comes several times a month, occasionally gives her a small amount of money, and receives his mail there. She does not know what his other address is. This sounds like a person with no usual residence who is in danger of not being counted in the census if this respondent doesn't list him. She might not list him; there are limits on the number of people her landlord will allow.

Household 706 A single young woman lives here with her children. When her younger sister walked in, the respondent said that this sister stays here off and on. The child's father helps out with finances and disciplining; one of his relatives came in and went to sleep on the couch during the interview. How many people really lived here? This respondent also had limits on the number of persons allowed in her housing unit and may have deliberately not listed her younger sister and her boyfriend's relative on the form to reduce the chance the landlord would learn she had too many people living there.[38]

Household 721 The respondent, her husband, and a grandchild live in this home. At present, she is taking care of her sick, elderly mother for four months. This respondent, her brother, and her sister take turns caring for their mother in their homes for four month intervals. Her brother takes care of their mother's financial affairs and pays most of the bills. This elderly mother has no one place where she stays most of the time; she moves among her adult children's homes at regular 4 month intervals. It would seem that the place she is living in on Census Day should be the place at which she should be counted, but the person at that house might not list her because she is just there temporarily.

4.1.6.4. Reasons for Living in Complex Households

The African American households included in this study formed due to divorces, separations, single parenthood, blended families, caregiving, child neglect, drugs, incarceration and death. In many of these cases, relatives, both close and distant, as well as some nonrelatives, opened their households to take in grandchildren and others directly or indirectly affected by these events,

---

[38] Limits on the number of persons allowed in a housing unit was also a factor in undercounting in the Korean and Latino studies, according to Kang and Blumberg/Goerman.

even when it meant they came under more stress and they had to make adjustments, such as coming out of retirement to work again. As Holmes says,

> The recurring themes of duty, obligation and sacrifice to help family and friends are a consistent response. There was a unifying theme that when family members are in need of assistance one has a responsibility to help. (Holmes 2002: 36).

Factors identified in this African American ethnographic study that may affect household type, relationships, and the accuracy of the census count include: 1) further evidence that the use of the "adopted child" category can mask biological relationships and the extent of household complexity (in this case, the laterally extended nature of household 707 due to the adopted children being "grand nephews"); 2) the emphasis on the wider kin network of grandparents, aunts/uncles, adult siblings, and others in the African American definition of "family" over the ideal of the independent nuclear family model in mainstream American society; 3) the definition of a household as those who share in doing chores, pooling resources, and sharing responsibilities as well as providing emotional and psychological support, rather than in terms of shared space in one physical dwelling, as we have seen in the Navajo and Inupiaq studies; 4) the new relationship category of "legal custody" that falls between foster child and adopted child, but is neither of these; 5) fear and mistrust of the government and its motives in collecting data, based on past patterns of discrimination, and possible omissions of persons to protect access to housing limiting the number of residents; and 6) errors in determining who is Person One, through misunderstanding of how to list persons or because of a deliberate choice of a respondent to mark something different.

Recommendations arising from this study include incorporating questions about adopted child and "legal custody" into semi-structured research on the relationship question that will be conducted in the near future; and more research to identify the potential benefits and adverse outcomes people take into account in weighing who they will and will not list on the census form.

We think there would also be use in further research on how people determine who should be listed as Person One. In household 725, the respondent deliberately listed herself as Person One, even though she arrived recently and would be moving out as soon as possible, because she was the oldest.

4.2 How well do the Census relationship question and categories capture emerging diversity of household types?

4.2.1. Limitations of the Method of Reckoning All Relationships to Person One Alone

The Census Bureau method of identifying relationships within the house by asking how each person is related to Person One has definite limitations. The first limitation is that

interrelationships among other persons in the household can be masked and not be identifiable either from the census form itself or in the data we produce. The second is that the classification of household type may change, sometimes dramatically, depending on who is listed as Person One, possibly distorting the distribution of household types that are used in developing programs, implementing the poverty definition, and allocating funding. The third is that we may not be able to ascertain whether Person Two is the biological parent of a coresident child in unmarried couple households and in some married couple households.

Here are some actual cases where the first two limitations–masking of interrelationships within the household and alteration of household type–become apparent during interviewing following the completion of mock census forms by respondents in this study:

In household 407, a rural white woman coresides with her child and her unmarried partner. He was listed as Person One, so the woman is marked as his unmarried partner and the child is classified as an "other nonrelative." The woman/child relationship is completely masked. As a result, this household is classified as a male householder nonfamily household. Had this woman listed herself as Person One, the mother-child link would be identified and the household would have been classified as a female householder family household. This very dramatic variation in household type for the same household is due to reckoning relationships only to Person One in the situation where her unmarried partner without children of hiw own occurs, we might look at the ages of the unmarried woman and her child, and consider it very likely that this youngster is the child of Person Two, but we cannot resolve this conclusively. We recommend the addition of a new relationship category to identify masked families such as this: "unmarried partner's child."

This household can show us the third limitation of reckoning relationships to Person One if we now list the woman in this household as Person One. As noted, the youngster is marked as her child, revealing the family nature of this household, while the man is marked as an unmarried partner. In this case, by reckoning relationships only to Person One, we cannot learn how the man is related to the child; he could be a nonrelative, but then again he could be the biological father of the child in this female householder family household.

Many researchers, policy makers and other data users may erroneously assume that "female householder family households" listed in census products are single women raising children without any coresident man–often referred to as "female-headed households"–but this is not correct. Some proportion of female householder family households in census tabulations include a coresident unrelated man who may or may not be contributing money to the household; in some cases this man might be the children's biological father. Thus children in some "female

householder family households" as well as in some "female householder nonfamily households" may be living with, and being supported and raised by both biological parents![39]

In case 102, four unrelated Latino adults shared a trailer. The female respondent lists one of the men as Person One, even though he just recently moved in, is not the owner or renter, and hasn't contributed money to the household. She lists the actual owner of the trailer next, and marks this woman as the unmarried partner of Person One. Finally she lists the other man and herself as roomer/boarders. By reckoning relationships just to Person One, we do not learn that persons three and four are also unmarried partners: this relationship is masked. Our Technical Documentation does clearly state that in the census we only count one married (or unmarried) couple per household, so we are aware that we are undercounting the total number of married (or unmarried) couples in the population, as this case demonstrates. It should be noted that choosing the wrong person to be Person One in household 102 altered the household type from what it should be–female householder nonfamily household–to male householder nonfamily household.

In case 119, a Latino immigrant lives in a trailer with seven other men who are unrelated to him; this is therefore classified as a male householder nonfamily household. However, there are two unrelated sets of brothers in this household. If one of those five had been Person One, this would have been classified as a male householder family household. In this case, it is impossible to fully describe the complexity of this household by reckoning relationships only to Person One; no one person as reference person would allow the combination of two sets of brothers and three persons unrelated to anyone else to be identified.

In the following cases, household type remained the same but relationships were masked:

A Navajo grandmother listed her son, daughter, and grandson on her census form. We might think it is very likely the grandson is the child of the adult son or the adult daughter, but we can't be sure. In the followup interviewing, Tongue ascertained that the grandson is not the son, but the nephew of both the adult son and adult daughter. He came to live with his grandmother when his mother died. This is revealed as a laterally extended household, although the Census Bureau does not currently tabulate this type of household composition.

A rural white woman listed her husband and her two foster children on the form. This masks the fact that the foster children were siblings.

---

[39] London points out another caveat in attempting to determine the number of single mothers from the number of female householder family households from CPS data. She distinguishes four living situations of single mothers: 1) mothers who live solely with their children, 2) mothers living in their parents' households with their children, 3) mothers and children cohabiting with an unrelated man, and 4) mothers and children sharing a place with others. According to her analysis, in 1995, close to a quarter of single mothers lived in households where someone else was listed as the householder: a parent, other relative, friend or partner (London: 1998).

A fourth problem with reckoning relationships just to Person One is that some respondents chose the wrong person to be Person One, either by mistake or by design. Two African American respondents listed children as Person One, while another listed herself because she "was the oldest" (she was not an owner or renter and was only staying temporarily). Two Korean respondents erroneously listed their nonresident children as Person One because the nonresident children had signed leases and rented the apartments on behalf of their parents who had no credit ratings. One Latino man listed the absentee trailer owner as Person One. In these Korean and Latino households, the listing of a nonresident owner/renter as Person One threw off the household types. Two Latino women respondents identified men in their households as Person One, even though they were not the owners or renters, as we saw in one example above. Several Navajos identified an inappropriate person as Person One. In many cases, these errors in choosing Person One not only led to erroneous classifications of their household type, but also resulted in errors in the number of persons counted in the household.

These are just a few of the types of household composition that can be masked by collecting relationships just to Person One. Martin (1998) also talks about the problem of getting different rosters and relationships depending on who is the respondent in the household.

Masking of relationships–particularly those in unmarried partner households–can bias the distributions of "household type" that are used in many census and survey publications, to unknown degrees. Masking can distort household structure data used by researchers, policy makers, businesses, and others, to determine 1) how money is allocated in federally funded nutrition and education programs, 2) how poverty is defined and poverty funds are allocated, and 3) how single parent and grandparent households, as well as those providing care to coresident elderly parents are identified and targeted for programs.

In Wave 2 of SIPP, the interrelationships of all persons in the household are collected in a household-level grid format that is transparent to the respondent, because SIPP is interviewer-administered and the instrument is in Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) format. Practically speaking, there is no way to design such a <u>household-level</u> relationship grid for a mailout form and expect respondents to understand and complete it.

However, it is possible to design <u>individual-level</u> questions to collect the relationship of each person to everyone else. This was actually done on the United Kingdom's 2001 household census form for England (see Appendix A). We understand that the United Kingdom Office of National Statistics did conduct some pretesting of this method and requested copies of their reports, but did not receive them by the deadline for finalizing this report.

We recommend development and testing of an individual-level question, along the lines of the England census form question, to identify all interrelationships in the house as a way to overcome all of the problems of reckoning relationship to Person One–masking of interrelationships, variations in basic household type, and lack of ability to identify both biological parents in unmarried households and in some married couple households. We are

quite aware that this would be a big change and that this new way of collecting relationships will take up considerably more space, but we think the potential payoff in accuracy of relationships and household types justifies preliminary question development and testing.

4.2.2. The number and types of relationships that are specified in stand-alone response categories set limits on the types of complex households that can be identified.

The relationship categories used by the Census Bureau reflect the relationships in our society deemed most important to specifically delineate at the time of each census and our norms for household composition. These categories express relationships based on kinship and marriage, cohabitation, and on economic (e.g., housemate/roommate) and/or legal ties (e.g., adopted child, foster child).

In the 1970 Census, just five relationship specific relationship categories were printed: household head, wife, child, roomer/boarder/lodger, and inmate/patient. Since the 1970 census, our country has diversified and every subsequent decennial census has had an increase in the number of relationship types deemed important to delineate specifically with their own stand-alone response categories (see Table 1). Most of these changes were to further delineate relationships in nuclear families and blended families, and to identify grandchildren and unmarried partners. The addition of new stand-alone categories for parent-in-law and son-in-law/daughter-in-law made it possible for Population Division analysts to analyze expanded data and write the first report on three and four multi-generational households in this country with a *lineal* focus: grandparent, parent (or parent-in-law), child (or child-in-law), and grandchild.

While we have been making steady progress in capturing more diverse lineal household types, we have just begun to explore more diverse lateral living arrangements with relatives such as nephews/nieces, cousins, brothers-in-law/sisters-in-law, and uncles/aunts. Evidence to support expanding the relationship categories to specify more lateral relationships comes from our complex households ethnographic study as well as from our analysis of tabulations of Census 2000 data done by Population Division analysts.

Results from this ethnographic study of complex households in six race/ethnic groups identify both *lineal* and *lateral* extended family households. For example, a number of the Latino households were both lineally and laterally extended, including parents of respondents, as well as brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, nephews, nieces, and/or cousins. Some Navajo households included adult siblings, nieces and nephews, and grandparents and some African American households included great nieces and nephews, adult siblings, and cousins.

Results from analysis of tabulations of Census 2000 data also suggest the need to add new lateral relationship categories to the 2010 census form. In the Census 2000 relationship question, lateral relationships, such as nephew/niece, uncle/aunt, cousin, and brother-in-law/sister-in-law, as well as the lineal category for grandparent, were not listed as stand-alone response categories; they fell

into the general category of "other relative." However, there was a write-in line for "other relative" and a sufficient number of respondents availed themselves of the opportunity to specify these relationships by writing them in that Population Division analysts assigned these relationship terms to specific post-census coding categories.

Using these data on write-ins provided by Population Division analysts, we calculated that 51.4 percent of the write-ins to the relationship question in Census 2000 were for the laterally extended kin categories including nephew/niece, brother-in-law/sister-in-law, cousin, uncle/aunt, and an additional 1.8 percent were for the lineally extended category of grandparent. In all 53.2 percent of the write-ins were for categories that delineate lateral and lineal relationships.

Thus there are three very compelling reasons to add these five relative categories to the relationship question for the 2010 census: cost savings and the ability to better identify and describe the growing diversity in this country. First, moving these most frequently marked write-in categories from the other relative category and printing each of them as a stand-alone category should reduce by half the amount of professional staff time and cost thereof that has to be devoted to recoding write-in responses in the immediate post-census period when so much work must be done in such a short time. Population Division is strongly in support of adding these categories to the relationship question and there is open discussion about dropping the write-in line altogether. Second, the addition of these categories will help us to better identify a wider range of complex household types as our population continues to diversify. Third, respondent friendliness will be increased–it is much easier and faster to mark a specific category, such as brother-in-law, than having to hunt in vain for it, mark the other relative box, and write this in.

4.2.3. The absence of definitions or instructions for cohabitors on choosing proper relationships for partners may lead to inconsistencies in marking "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" congruent with our official definitions, possibly reducing the quality of data on relationships and affecting the distribution of household types.

The ethnographers present considerable evidence that there are inconsistencies in how cohabiting couples mark relationships for each other and for a child of one of them.

There are three factors that may contribute to this: the first has to do with our categories on the form not fully matching our official concepts; the second has to do with different interpretations of the meanings of "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" in some subpopulations; and the third has to do with unwillingness of cohabiting persons to mark "unmarried partner" on a questionnaire.

First, according to the Census 2000 Technical Documentation, married couple households are comprised of spouses who live together and husband/wife or spouse include those in formal marriages and in common law marriages. On the census form, there is no response category for "common law husband/wife" and no instruction for common law partners to mark

"husband/wife." The official definitions are not fully operationalized on the census form. Faced with a choice of "husband/wife" or "unmarried partner" some common law partners may mark "husband/wife," others might mark "unmarried partner," or something else, or leave it blank. Inconsistencies in responses may reduce the accuracy of the data and bias the distributions.

Hewner tells us of her nine respondents who were in cohabiting relationships and how they varied; just four of the nine recorded themselves as unmarried couples. The rest marked categories such as husband/wife, other relative (2), other nonrelative (2), and housemate (1).

Second, there may be differing cultural connotations of "husband" and "wife" that may not necessarily be bound to formal marriage. Tongue tells us that among the Navajo, the words "husband/wife" are used to refer to "the one you are living with," without the requirement of formal marriage. She quotes a Navajo as saying, "If someone is hanging out with someone in a dating sort of way, then the partner just moves in and we call them married." Another says, "Traditionally they say that once you bring a man home, you're married." Here, there is a cultural difference in the use of a term that may affect the accuracy of household type.

And, among Latinos, there was variation among respondents in whether the words used on the Spanish language version of the census form, *esposo/esposa*, are used solely for couples who are formally married or also include unmarried couples. This is also a cultural and linguistic issue that will be discussed below.

Hewner gives another reason why cohabitors might mark themselves as married. In her area, common law marriages are common; some of the couples she interviewed had been together for more than 30 years. To them, "unmarried partner" or "girlfriend" weren't appropriate for describing their relationships.

Third, there were two cases where it was documented that respondents were unwilling to mark the unmarried partner category on the questionnaire, revealing that they were cohabiting. In the rural white study, one respondent expressed anger that she was forced to either lie (mark husband/wife rather than unmarried partner) or break the law (by not completing and mailing her census form). In the Korean study, a man who seemed to be in an unmarried partner situation would not mark that category or even openly indicate it to the ethnographer, despite friendly joking and probing by the Korean male ethnographer. In relating this incident, the ethnographer states that in Korean culture, such relationships are not disclosed to outsiders. These two cases suggest that respondents may not have marked the category because of lingering stigma over cohabitation.[40]

---

[40] The stigma associated with cohabitation has declined significantly since the 1960s. In the late 1980s, according to Bumpass (1990), only one-sixth of young persons disapproved of cohabitation under any circumstances. At that time, he estimated more than half of persons in their 30s had cohabited and more than half of recent marriages had been preceded by cohabiting).

So, lack of instructions on the form as to how to classify common law partners, differing cultural connotations of husband/wife and *esposo/esposa*, and social desirability are some reasons why cohabitors might be inconsistent in how they classify their relationships. To the extent that they mark categories other than "unmarried partner" we are getting inaccurate counts of married couples relative to other families.

4.2.4. The Relationship Categories are not Always Mutually Exclusive

While the relationship categories may seem to be mutually exclusive, there are situations in which this is not the case; two answers may be correct from the viewpoint of the respondents. The choice of one or the other may cause household type to vary and sometimes to be masked. Craver notes that 40 percent of her Inupiaq mock census forms masked actual relationships and hence household structure, because biological grandchildren were listed as adopted children on the census form. From the marked relationships on the mock census form, these appear to be two-generation, single parent or married couple households with adopted children, but they are really skip generation grandparent-maintained households consisting of a divorced, widowed or married grandparent raising grandchildren. We understand that Population Division would rather have respondents mark adopted child than grandchild in cases like this, but this renders the biological link of grandchild invisible and masks the skip generation nature of the household. This seems counter-intuitive to us.

Craver recommends we try to develop some way to determine if children who are adopted also have a biological relationship with the householder, and to identify what that relationship is. This problem of marking adopted child rather than grandchild was not unique to the Inupiat; there were also cases like this among the rural whites and the Navajo. Blumberg and Goerman also point to another situation where the relationship categories were not mutually exclusive: the case of the man who marked his niece and nephew as "*hijo de crianza*" (foster children).

This practice of marking "adopted child" for grandchildren or other relatives may be leading to underestimates of the number of multigenerational households in censuses and surveys, particularly for the Inupiat. The marking of the "adopted child" category for children informally adopted is not consistent with the official census definition of adopted children as formally and legally adopted. A newly released first-ever report on adopted children (Kreider 2003) acknowledges that Census 2000 data on adopted children includes children both formally and informally adopted. According to this report, Census 2000 recorded 2.1 million adopted children and 4.4 million stepchildren. These results were widely reported in the media on the day the report was released.

4.2.5. Two new relationship categories for possible inclusion in the relationship question

Two new relationship types were identified by the ethnographers: caregiving/receiving relationships and person under legal custody.

Hewner suggested that a new household-level category be added to the relationship question to identify caregiver households.[41] Her recommendation was based on merged households in her sample due to caregiving and a household in which a woman was providing board and care for elderly women that couldn't be adequately described in the relationship category "roomer/boarder."[42]

There have been calls for a category reflecting an individual-level, care-receiving relationship from within the Census Bureau's Population Division, along the lines of "person in custodial care." This new category is proposed to cover two situations. The first includes small group homes providing board and care to people who are 1) disabled; 2) mentally retarded; 3) mentally ill; 4) disabled; and 5) recovering from alcohol and drug abuse. The second may include persons who are marked on census forms as foster children, but who are age 18 and above, some of whom may be in adult foster care situations very similar to that provided in household 410 described by Hewner. Results of exploratory research on this topic have just been reported (Hunter, Schwede and Aaker 2003). Development and testing of a new category along the lines of "person in custodial care" is currently under consideration.

Holmes also suggested a new category of relationship. Hers appears to fall between adopted child and foster child. This is "legal custody" and she had eight cases where a "legal custody" arrangement was found: seven cases for relatives and one for a nonrelative. She writes that in Virginia:

> "Legal custody" means a legal status treated by court order which vests in a custodian the right to have physical custody of the child, to determine and undetermine where and with whom he shall live, the right and duty to protect, train, and discipline him and to provide him with food, shelter, education, and ordinary medical care, all subject to residual parental rights and responsibilities.

---

[41] Stephanie Coontz (2001) also seems to be arguing for the creation of a new caregiver category for a person spending several days a week at an aging parent's house providing care. According to her, one in four households is providing considerable time and care to an elderly relative, and the majority of householders say they expect to be doing so within the next decade.

[42] Brief descriptions of these types of caregiving households are included in Section 4.1.5. Household 416 typifies the merged household for caregiving while household 410 is an example of a board and care facility where "roomer/boarder" doesn't describe the caregiving relationship adequately.

(Commonwealth of Virginia. Virginia Family and Juvenile Laws and Rules Annotated. 2001 Edition. Richmond, Virginia).

At this time we don't know how many states have "legal custody" and whether their definitions are consistent or not. Holmes suggested that we should consider doing research on the extent and nature of legal custody arrangements to assess whether legal custody should be added as a relationship category. She asserts that there are major policy implications arising out of the legal custody status and how it differs from the foster care and adopted statuses. She also thinks this may have implications for the undercounting of children in the census.

As she notes, adding this category would require changing the instructions to allow respondents to mark more than one relationship category. Holmes is not the only one to suggest changing the instructions to allow more than one relationship to be marked for a person. As noted earlier, Craver found that Inupiaq adoption of relatives is quite common and that the forced choice of one category masks important information about the relationships among these persons. Blumberg and Goerman noted that the man who marked *hijo de crianza* (foster child) could also have marked niece/nephew and suggested other situations where the relationship categories are not mutually exclusive. Tongue just mentions in passing that some Navajo grandparents need to get legal custody of their grandchildren in order to be able to enroll them in school or get medical service when their parents are away working.

However, adding a new category for "child in legal custody" would involve changing the instruction in the relationship question to allow more than one answer; this would be a major change that could potentially cause a lot of confusion for the majority of respondents who would only have one relationship to the householder. Perhaps research should be done to see how widespread these problems with legal custody and adopted child relationships are.

4.3 Wider Issues Identified in this Study

There are five wider issues running through the ethnographic descriptive summaries studies that we identify in this section. They are 1) selected cultural, linguistic, and nationality differences with census concepts, methods, and procedures; 2) language and translation issues and the need for pretesting translated forms; 3) conceptual differences in the definition and application of the key census concept of "household"; 4) mobility patterns and respondents' conceptions of who is a household member that may not match our fundamental residence rule concept of "usual residence"; and 5) fear and mistrust of the government and pledges of confidentiality that may affect response and coverage.

4.3.1. Selected cultural, linguistic, and nationality differences with census concepts, methods, and procedures

Most of the body of this report is devoted to ethnographic descriptions of the six ethnic groups included in the complex households study: Navajos on the reservation in Arizona; Inupiaq Eskimos in Alaska; Latino immigrants in central Virginia; Korean immigrants in Queens, New York; rural whites in western New York state, and African Americans in southeastern Virginia. Some of the most salient differences that may affect the quality of the census are the following:

4.3.1.1. Latino naming customs

Each Latino person has two *last* names. The first is the name of one's father, and this is the principal name. The second is the mother's surname. Non-Latino persons in the U.S. often wrongly presume that the last one is the primary surname and this can cause problems. There is even more variation for Latino women; some continue to use their father's name as their principal surname, while others may add their husband's name, preceded by "de." A woman may thus have three surnames. The child would use both of his parents' fathers' names. This may result in the mother, father and child in the same household all having different surnames on a census form. Ethnographers Blumberg and Goerman point out that there is not enough room on the line for last name on the census form for Latinos to record their full names and respondents may therefore vary in which names they record. These differences in naming customs and how they may not be consistently applied on census forms may lead to difficulties and errors in matching Latinos in reinterviews and coverage evaluations.

4.3.1.2. Navajo matrilineal kinship system and different kinship terms

The Navajo matrilineal kinship system makes distinctions between relationships on male and female sides that are not made in the bilateral kinship system used in the overall culture. As noted in 4.1.1., the Navajo kinship system differentiates the roles, rights, and responsibilities of persons on the basis of relationship through the maternal or paternal sides and clan memberships, whereas the mainstream American kinship system does not distinguish between them. Paternal grandparents are not the lateral equivalent of maternal grandparents and Navajos have more relationship categories to distinguish these than are available in the modal kinship system. The grandchild of one's son is a "nali" and the grandchild of one's daughter is a "tsui." To deal with the typical relationship question and categories on census and survey forms, such as "grandchild," Navajos first have to determine which side the grandchild is on before deciding what relationship category to mark, sometimes writing in "nali" or "tsui" on the other relative line, other times leaving the question blank. The ethnographer notes that when "grandchild" was checked by respondents on the mock census forms during her interviews, it inevitably meant the child of one's daughter, a "tsui," never a "nali."

Since Indian reservations are enumerated in personal visit interviews rather than by mail, a special component could be integrated into enumerator training identifying this cultural difference in kinship terms and specifying unique ways in which enumerators would ask respondents to distinguish relatives on the male side from those on the female side so that the enumerator could accurately record relationships. Some system of data editing for Navajos might also prove useful in ensuring the comparability of Navajo relationship data to that of the whole population.

The Navajos are not the only matrilineal American Indian tribe in the country. Blumberg points out (forthcoming) that six of the eight largest American Indian tribes groups are matrilineal.

There are also patrilineal systems among other American Indian tribes that have similar mismatches of native and mainstream relationship categories. Special training of enumerators is needed to identify these cultural differences and to handle them in a culturally appropriate manner to get data consistent with those from mainstream American households.

Kang tells us that in the traditional patrilineal kinship system, Koreans have elaborate terms to distinguish older grandfathers from younger grandfathers. He did not mention that any respondents added special modifiers to their census forms when completing them.

4.3.1.3. Inupiaq customs of grandparents formally or informally adopting their grandchildren

Craver documents a large number of skip generation households in which grandparents are raising grandchildren who are considered to be "adopted children," even though they may not have been legally adopted through a court. She notes that these grandparents may consider these children to be both adopted children and grandchildren, and could mark two relationship categories, or one or the other. If the respondents choose to mark them as "adopted children" rather than grandchildren, the pattern of relationships on the census form makes them appear to be two-generation households, when in fact they are skip-generation grandparent maintained households. Hence this cultural practice may result in inconsistent marking of the relationship category, over-representing the number of formally adopted children and underrepresenting the distribution of multigenerational household types.

4.3.2. Language and Translation Issues and the Need for Pretesting Translated Forms

The Latino and Korean immigrant studies highlighted a number of issues that came up with the Census 2000 form that was translated into Spanish and Korean, without pretesting in those languages.

These studies show that "foster child" and "adopted child" are culture-bound terms that apply to specific social and legal institutions in the United States that may either not exist in other

countries or mean something different. They may not be understood by people from different cultures and/or nationalities and may lead to errors in recording of relationships and issues of cross-cultural validity.

According to Census Bureau definitions for Census 2000, a "foster child" is a person under 18 who is placed by a government agency in a nonrelated household to receive parental care. Americans who were born here and others who have become acculturated will understand this.

The primary example of language and translation issues in this report is of the use of the term, *hijo de crianza* for foster child on the Spanish language version of the Census 2000 form. A Latino respondent marked *hijo de crianza*, instead of writing in niece and nephew for his sisters' children who were living with him. According to Goerman and Blumberg, the Spanish term, *hijo de crianza,* refers to a child one is raising for a friend or relative and has no connotation of taking in a unrelated child from a government agency with regular payments for that child's care, as shown in the definition above. The reader may think that this is just one case and it may be just be a fluke, but the same lack of congruity between *hijo de crianza* and foster child was identified in two other recent studies by Carrasco: one with Spanish speaking respondents and the other with bilingual Census Bureau field representatives. We are likely to be getting overcounts of foster children in Latino households because of cross-cultural and linguistic differences in the meaning of foster child and *hijo de crianza.* Perhaps at least some of the anomalous 10 to 15 percent of the persons marked as "foster children" who are above 18 years old in Census 2000 are Latinos who had a Spanish language questionnaire and marked *hijo de crianza.*

Further, the majority of Latino respondents did not perceive any difference between *hijo de crianza* and adopted child. As a result of these problems, our tabulations for Latino foster children and adopted children may be somewhat skewed.

The Latino study also showed that the term "*hogar*" (for household) has strong associations with home and the nuclear family. When respondents were asked if it could also be used for extended families, many agreed. However, many did not think that the word was appropriate for households comprised of non-related persons. Goerman suggests we consider testing *hogar* and other words.

The Latinos also differed in whether unmarried couples should be recorded as *esposos*, the translation for spouses. One Mexican said that this is the way it is recorded in Mexico. Others insisted that *esposo/esposa* was limited to those formally married and *marido/mujer* (husband/woman) might be more appropriate for unmarried partners. However, there was variation among her respondents and Goerman suggests there might be nationality differences among Latinos in how these words are used and we need more research on this. Use of the word, "*quedarse*," (translation for stay) on the census form may be problematic too.

Tai Kang also reported that some of the translations on the Korean form were not functionally equivalent.[43] Foster child is a category that doesn't exist for the Koreans: they have no such cultural institution in Korea, according to Kang. Additionally, foster child was translated as "child under trusteeship," which in itself is confusing. "Roommate" was just transliterated into Korean characters, without providing any meaning, and Koreans did not know how to distinguish among roommate, housemate, roomer and boarder. He suggests that a gestalt approach be used, looking for the concept in the other language, rather than trying to do a literal translation.

In Census Bureau documentation, an adopted child is one who has been legally adopted. As just discussed, informal adoption has been and continues to be a central part of Inupiaq Eskimo social organization and forty percent of Craver's households had children who were adopted, either formally or informally. Cases of informal adoption and the marking of the adopted child category also were documented in the Latino, Navajo, and white studies. As a result, we may be getting more children marked as adopted children on census forms than there are formally and legally adopted children in the population. This is noted in the newly released report on adopted and stepchildren in Census 2000 (Kreider 2003). On the other hand, Koreans were confused by the "adopted child" category, because, according to Kang, Koreans will only take into their home a close relative, not an unrelated person formerly unknown to them. There may have been underreporting of adopted children among the Koreans.

Relationship terms have evolved in the context of mainstream American culture and institutions and may not be easily translatable into foreign language versions of the census form. Literal translations of key terms into Spanish, Korean, and other target languages can lead to reporting errors. Special care needs to be taken in translating conceptually rather than literally, and in conducting cognitive pretesting of foreign language versions of forms to determine if translated terms are functionally equivalent before they are used in live censuses.

Cultural, linguistic, and national differences with census concepts, methods, and procedures such as those presented here need to be identified, explored and taken into account when developing forms, methods, training, and procedures.

---

[43] Yuling Pan, our new sociolinguist, found a very large problem with the Chinese translation for "stepdaughter." When the word on the form is read by people from some rural regions of China, it sounds like the word for prostitute. One of Pan's early respondents broke out laughing when she read the term but would not explain the problem. It was only later that the problem was identified. A regular program of pretesting translated forms in languages other than English would help to identify problems like this before the translated form is finalized and mailed out.

4.3.3. Conceptual differences in the definition and application of the key census concept of "household"

There is a mismatch between the census definition of "household" and the definitions of respondents in different ethnic and cultural groups that may lead to miscounting and misclassification of household types. The Census Bureau definition basically says that a household consists of all of the people who live in one housing unit. The number of households therefore equals the number of housing units. In this study, we found that many Navajo and Inupiaq respondents do not identify households in terms of shared physical structure, but rather on the basis of sharing of domestic functions such as earning and pooling income, cooperating in subsistence activities, cooking, child care, child raising, and other domestic tasks. Emotional closeness is also a key component in determining who is part of one's household. The ethnographers document cases of "households without walls" where persons from more than one housing unit identify themselves as one household as well as the converse: people sharing one housing unit who consider themselves to be separate households. This ambiguity in the boundaries of "household" has been documented by anthropologists, sociologists, economists, and others. Wilk and Miller (1997), for example, suggest the basis of the problem is in the assumption of household corporateness: that there is a clear boundary around those who belong to the household and those who do not and that this is defined by coresidence. They suggest research is needed on 1) degrees of household corporateness, 2) different kinds of household membership and their associated bundles of rights, obligations, and commitments, and 3) overlapping and multiple household memberships, with investigation of the types of social ties (e.g. descent, sexual, and legal) that bind people to different or distant groups.

4.3.4. Mobility patterns and respondents' conceptions of who is a household member may not match our fundamental census residence rule concept of "usual residence"

All six ethnographic summaries in the body of this report include cases in which mobility patterns led to ambiguity between the household membership status from the perspective of the respondents and the official membership status according to the census residence rules. We have both *de jure* residence rules, that count people at their "usual residence" where they are most of the time, regardless of where they are physically staying on Census Day, and *de facto* residence rules for certain places and situations that dictate they must be counted there on Census Day, regardless of where they feel they belong or where they live most of the time. There is thus a fundamental contradiction in our residence rules between where one lives most of the time and where one is staying on one particular day. There are situations in which it is possible for a person to be counted correctly in two places at once. Finally, a respondent's opinion of where he/she may "belong" may not match either our *de jure* or *de facto* rules. This is a potential source of miscounts, with either duplications and/or *jure* or *de facto* rules. This is a potential source of miscounts, with either duplications and/or omissions.

We identified the following mobility patterns for households in this study:

- long-distance cyclical mobility to and from Navajo and Inupiaq households for temporary wage labor jobs;
- cross-national cyclical mobility between households in Latin America and Latino households in Virginia for wage labor jobs;
- seasonal cyclical mobility for subsistence activities among the Inupiat or to escape cold winters among rural whites called "snowbirds;"
- mobility for purposes of higher education, found in most of the samples;
- frequent movement of children among households for the Navajo and Inupiat for schooling and other purposes and for joint custody among rural whites;
- cyclic movement of elderly persons between their own houses and their relatives' houses (Navajo) and among households of adult children (African American);
- sporadic movements of tenuously attached persons (African American); and
- temporary ad hoc moves of indeterminate length into the houses of sick and/or elderly relatives who can no longer manage for themselves (rural whites and Inupiat).

The nature and duration of such moves as well as the anchor household respondents' interpretation of who is a household member may cause ambiguities in determining where a person should be counted in the census. It is sometimes not easy to determine where mobile persons should be counted according to census residence rules, for on the one hand, the respondent identifies them as household members who live there, but on the other hand, the persons are not physically staying there "most of the time." A number of anomalous cases in which the determination of residence as where one "belongs" may not always fit the census residence rule of where one lives "most of the time" or where one is staying on Census Day are described in the text.

There is wide recognition in the Census Bureau that some of the census residence rules may be a barrier to full and accurate enumeration. There has been considerable research on this since at least the early 1990s and there is an interdivisional working group examining the rules and considering revisions to them for the next census. The author is a member of this group.

4.3.5. Fear and mistrust of the government and pledges of confidentiality

Fear and/or mistrust of government and its pledges of confidentiality were themes that ran through the recruitment, completion of mock census forms by respondents, and interviewing in the Navajo, immigrant Korean, immigrant Latino, and African American ethnographic studies.

This may relate to discussions of correlation bias in coverage evaluations resulting from persons being missed in both the census and in the coverage followup study. Tongue and Kang had the most difficulty in recruiting and completing interviews, even though they both used well-known and respected local Navajo and Korean community leaders as cultural liaisons. In several cases, he was thrown out of the apartments during interviews by relatives of the respondents who insisted the interviews by terminated immediately! Kang documented several cases where respondents omitted persons from the mock census forms who should have been included because of fear of deportation or of losing leases restricting the number of residents, or losing government benefits. Some Latinos were very concerned about rumors that the Immigration and Naturalization Service would get access to census forms and expel them from the country. Holmes reports that many African Americans believe that mainstream Americans looks down on their household structure. As a result some African Americans are mistrustful of government efforts to learn who lives with them and skeptical about the uses of the data, and this may lead to lower response rates and underreporting of residents..

In this study, we also found evidence of underreporting of children among the Latinos and among some African American households that might have been related to fears of losing housing with strict limits on the number of permitted residents. Further, some Navajo and Latino respondents did not list some children on their mock census forms, saying they were not sure if children should be included. This is consistent with estimates of large undercounts of children in American Indian reservation households and in rural Latino renter household in the 1990 census (West and Robinson 1999) and undercounts of children in England (Chambers, Brown and Diamond 2002).

These findings point to the need for more detailed analyses of correlation bias for ethnic subpopulations and for children, especially for foreign immigrants since the September 11 terrorist attacks.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

In this report, we provided information on diversification of household types that has occurred in household structure since the 1960s and identified some of the demographic trends contributing to these changes. We identified the purposes of including the relationship question on the census form and the importance of this question in constructing the variable, "household type." We documented the steadily increasing number and specificity of relationship question categories in each decennial census since 1970 in Table 1. We identified critical differences between the Census 2000 and the American Community Survey (ACS) lists of relationship response categories in Table 3 and presented evidence to show that the census list of response categories is clearly the better of the two for documenting the range of household types. We introduced the concept of complex households and provided a brief review of the literature and ongoing research related to this topic, and described the complex households research project and its methods.

In Section 4.1, we presented targeted ethnographic descriptive summaries related to complex households for each of the six ethnic groups. In Section 4.2, we identified issues and limitations with the relationship question and household type variable specifically: the method of asking relationships to Person One only, 2) the number and types of relationships that are specified in response categories; 3) the absence of definitions or instructions for cohabitors on choosing proper relationships for partners that may lead to inconsistencies in marking "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" congruent with our official definitions, possibly reducing the quality of data on relationships and affecting the distribution of household types, and 4) relationship categories that are not always mutually exclusive.

In Section 4.3, we identified and discussed four wider issues running through the studies during the course of the project: 1) selected cultural, linguistic, and nationality differences with census concepts, methods, and procedures; 2) language issues and the need for pretesting translated forms; 3) conceptual differences in the definition and application of the key census concept of "household;" 4) mobility patterns and respondents' conceptions of who is a household member that may not match our fundamental residence rule concept of "usual residence"; 5)and fear and mistrust of the government and pledges of confidentiality that may affect response and coverage.

5.2 Conclusions and Recommendations

The relationship categories used by the Census Bureau reflect the relationships in our society deemed most important to delineate at the time of each census and our norms for households composition. These categories express relationships based on kinship and marriage, cohabitation, and on economic (e.g., housemate/roommate) and/or legal ties (e.g. adopted child,

foster child). The married couple family with children, typified by the Ozzie and Harriet and Leave it to Beaver, that was the modal household type in this country in the 1960s is no longer the most common.

Since 1970, relationship categories have steadily increased in number and specificity from seven in 1970 to 15 in Census 2000 reflecting changes occurring in household composition in the nation's population. The changes are a result of demographic factors such as increasing numbers of divorces, remarriages, and cohabiting couples with children that have created a diversity of blended family arrangements; increases in grandparent-maintained families; and increases in the numbers of multigenerational families and households.

It should be noted that alternative household composition patterns based on wider relations with kin appear to have been the norm in the past and present for some ethnic subpopulations within the United States that were included in this ethnographic project, such as the Navajo, Inupiat, and African Americans, as a result of different cultural norms on household composition, economic conditions, or other factors. Tongue tells us about Navajo families with grandparents, aunts, and nieces and nephews and the very frequent movement of people among households on the reservation as well as outside it. Craver tells us about the prevalence of Inupiaq skip generational households where grandparents provide anchor households and often informally adopt their grandchildren, while children and adults are mobile. Holmes shows us that it is the extended family sometimes spread across different households, not the nuclear family, that is the important unit of social organization. Hewner shows us that mostly middle-class whites also form complex households.

Other demographic trends that may be contributing to increases in the numbers and types of complex households include increasing immigration rates and changing migration streams, with more immigrants coming from Latin America and Asia. As mentioned in Section 1, there has been a very rapid increase in the numbers of immigrants, with 11.5 percent of the noninstitutionalized civilian population being foreign born as of March, 2002. The larger average number of adults in foreign born households as well as the larger average overall size of these households strongly suggests that many of these new households are complex.

Blumberg and Goerman have shown us that recent immigrants may live in very large complex households with siblings, brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, cousins, mere acquaintances from their home country villages, and/or other nonrelatives in order to save money to establish themselves in this country or to send money back to support family members in their natal or conjugal family households in their home countries. Kang demonstrates how Korean immigrants are attracted to the opportunities and relative cultural homogeneity of Queens, New York and that Korean families and individuals need to take in boarders or roommates to be able to afford housing in a high rent area. They may also form multigenerational households with respondents' parents brought over from Korea to care for the respondents' children, do housework, and perhaps engage in the informal economy while the respondents and spouses go out to work to support the family.

Hence, new demographic trends, coupled with the information in this report, suggest that the numbers and types of complex households may continue to grow through the decade. As shown by the quote from the new Strategic Plan for the Census Bureau, we need to look at new methods and new questions in response to the growing cultural diversity in this country.

Recommendations are made in the following areas: 1) relationship question revisions; 2) new research on the relationship question and household type; 3) language and translation issues; 4) outreach and training; and 5) new ethnographic research related to coverage.

5.2.1. Recommended Revisions to the Relationship Question

- **Expand the number and precision of response categories in the relationship question to reflect the growing cultural diversity of this country and its household composition in the new millennium.** This recommendation is consistent with the Census Bureau's pattern in every decennial census since 1970 of expanding the number and precision of relationship categories to better reflect demographic changes in the population. It is also consistent with the Census Bureau's new Strategic Plan for 2004-2008 that recognizes that increasing racial and ethnic diversity:

  > ...will continue to bring new challenges to how the Census Bureau conducts its work. It will affect the methods the Census Bureau uses to collect information, the questions asked, and the presentation of data. (Census Bureau 2002: 22).

  It is also consistent with recommendations from Population Division.

  We believe these reasons are compelling enough to justify the additional space these categories will require on the 2010 census form where we know that "real estate" is very precious and extra space is hard to come by.

  - **Add niece/nephew, aunt/uncle, cousin, brother-in-law/sister-in-law, and grandparent as specific response categories for relatives in the relationship question to better reflect the range of complex households.** There are three justifications for this. First, there will be time and cost savings–more than 50 percent of the write-ins to the Census 2000 relationship question were comprised of these categories; adding them as stand-alone categories will reduce the time and costs of recoding write-ins. Second, the addition of these categories will allow analysts and data users to more precisely delineate complex lineally and laterally extended and multigenerational family household types. This may help to identify households in poverty and to assist in the equitable distribution of funds in federal programs based on household type data. Third, respondent friendliness will be increased–it is much easier and faster to mark a specific

category, such as brother-in-law, than having to hunt in vain for it, mark the other relative box, and write this in.

- **Add "child of unmarried partner" as a specific response category for nonrelatives in the relationship question to obtain more accurate information on the numbers and types of unmarried households with children.** This will mitigate, to some extent, the problem of masking of the relationship of a child to an unmarried partner when the nonparental partner is listed as Person One on the census form. This is a result of the method of reckoning relationships to Person One only, and occurs when Person One is the nonparental unmarried partner, masking the parent-child relationship between Persons 2 and 3.

- **If consistency between the census short form and the American Community Survey (ACS) form questions is a priority for 2010, modify the new ACS question along the lines of the decennial short form, not vice versa.** As shown in Table 3, the American Community Survey relationship question has even fewer relationship categories than the census form; it cannot distinguish 1) stepchildren and adopted children from natural born children and 2) parent-in-law from son-in-law/daughter-in-law, and 3) doesn't allow any write-in for "other relative," so that nephew/niece, uncle/aunt, brother-in-law/sister-in-law, cousin, and grandparent cannot be disaggregated. This puts severe limitations on the types of complex households that can be identified with ACS data.

- **Design research and conduct semi-structured interviews on an expanded list of relationship terms, develop new wording for relationship terms, particularly for person in custodial care, and conduct cognitive testing.** This has already been approved and research has commenced soon.

- **Conduct a split-panel test using three alternative versions of the relationship question and response categories in the 2005 Content Test.** Use the Census 2000 version as a control, with two experimental versions. The first experimental version would be the American Community Survey version (which has never been cognitively tested). The second experimental version would include changes recommended in this report, including new printed categories for nephew/niece, uncle/aunt, brother-in-law/sister-in-law, cousin, grandparent, and child of unmarried partner. Population Division has also recommended these additions as well as some additional changes. The recommendation for this split-panel test was made to the 2010 Content Research and Development Working Group by Schwede last summer and has been accepted and incorporated into the testing cycle leading up to the 2005 test.

5.2.2. Recommendations for New Research on the Relationship Question and Household Type

- **Design new research to develop, then test, an individual-level question on a mailout form to identify all interrelationships in the household, not just relationship to Person One, as was already done on the 2001 England household census form, shown in Appendix A.** Individual-level questions collecting all interrelationships in the household could solve all of the problems resulting from reckoning relationships to Person One only: masking of interrelationships, dramatic variations in basic household type in terms of family/nonfamily and/or male/female householder type; (depending on who is listed as Person one) and lack of ability to identify both biological parents in unmarried and some married couple households. We are quite aware that this would be a big change and that this new way of collecting relationships would likely take up more space on the census form, but we think the potential payoff in accuracy of relationships and household types justifies at least preliminary question development and testing.

- **Design quantitative and qualitative research to assess how accurately the relationship categories of "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" differentiate married couple, male householder, and female householder household types by comparing with actual marital status.** Ethnographic data from the rural white, Hispanic, and Navajo studies reported here suggest we might want new research to examine underlying assumptions that answers of "husband/wife" and "unmarried partner" to the relationship question are valid and reliable indicators of marital status for the construction of Household Type. As a result, we recommend the following:

  Conduct quantitative testing of the goodness of fit between answers to the marital status question and answers of "husband/wife," "unmarried partner," and other nonrelative categories to the relationship question, using Census 2000 unedited long form data files. We are not aware of any previous statistical studies that assess the correlations between the marital status question and these relationship categories. We suggest conducting statistical testing with unedited Census 2000 long form data to determine the correlations between marital status and these relationship categories for different ethnic groups. At present these data are available only in state-level files and a national level file would need to be developed for this analysis.

  Conduct qualitative exploratory research on the meanings of marital status and associated relationship terms in different ethnic groups and how differences in the meanings and usages of these terms affect the validity of the household type variable that distinguishes "married couple" families from "other families." Semi-structured interviews could explore how respondents in different ethnic groups define marriage, common law marriage, cohabitation, living together, husband/wife, spouse, unmarried partner, girlfriend/boyfriend and other terms people may spontaneously use and how they

report these relationships on censuses and surveys. We would include respondents of different ethnic groups in unmarried couple relationships of long duration (common law marriages) and shorter durations, as well as those formally married. We could include some same sex unmarried couples. According to our Census 2000 Technical Documentation, "married couple" refers to formal marriages as well as common law marriages. However, the term "common law partner" does not appear anywhere on the census form. How do people in common law marriages mark the relationship question? What are the differences between a "common law partner" and an "unmarried partner?" What do people think "unmarried partner" means and is it the right term to use for "people who are sharing living quarters and who also have a close personal relationship with each other?" What factors determine whether a person in an unmarried couple report as a husband/wife, as an unmarried partner, or as something else?

Additional questions for research might include: Do legal definitions of "common law marriage" differ among states? Could we develop a new relationship category for "common law partner" to print on the census form that would reliably distinguish long-term cohabiting couples from formally married couples on the one hand and short-term cohabiting "unmarried partners" on the other? How do differences between "common law partner" and "unmarried partner" affect the validity of the household type variable, distinguishing "married couple" families from other families?

Conduct cognitive testing to compare answers persons give to standard marital and relationship survey questions with answers they give to retrospective questions designed to ascertain whether persons are formally married or not and how long they had been living together.

5.2.3. Recommendations on Language and Translation Issues

- **Increase the scope and size of the new "Language Research" and "Translating Demographic Surveys" projects to identify linguistic, cultural, cognitive, and methodological issues in developing foreign language versions of census and survey forms and develop and test improved foreign language forms.**

    - Conduct cross-national linguistic research to explore whether there are dialectical and/or national differences in the usage of key relationship terms, such as "*esposo/esposa*" (spouse) and other critical terms, such as "*hogar*" (household).

- Adopt a Census Bureau wide policy to research and test data collection methodologies in languages other than English. This is under consideration.

- Develop and test standardized protocols for systematic identification and assessment of linguistic, cultural, cognitive, and methodological issues in developing questionnaires in target languages.

- Require target language questionnaires to be pretested before they are fielded to ensure they are functionally equivalent to the English instrument.

5.2.4. Recommendations on Outreach and Training

- **Expand outreach efforts and develop new outreach messages to immigrant Koreans, immigrant Latinos, and immigrants from other countries to maintain and improve coverage levels of the foreign born in the post-September 11th era for the 2004 site test and beyond**. Mistrust of the government and fear of deportation or loss of benefits or housing leading to underreporting of persons or refusal to complete and return forms were mentioned in Kang's study of Korean households and Blumberg and Goerman's study of Latinos conducted in 2000 as part of this project. Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and subsequent crackdowns on illegal immigrants, as well as identification and questioning of persons from certain foreign countries as a result of the Iraq war buildup, it is likely that underreporting and nonresponse may be increasing substantially.

- **Develop special training modules for enumerators on American Indian reservations and in Alaska Native areas. That would identify cultural factors that may affect the way respondents interpret and answer census and survey questions and provide instructions and procedures on how to help respondents "translate" their answers into the appropriate Census Bureau categories.**

  A special enumerator training module should be developed and tested for Navajo respondents. Tongue's ethnographic study clearly shows that Navajos, with their matrilineal kinship system, distinguish grandchildren (and other relatives) on the basis of whether they are on the female or male side; there are different Navajo relationship terms of "nali" and "tsui." Navajo respondents are confused when confronted with just one relationship category on the census form for "grandchild;" Tongue says they invariably mark "grandchild" only when the grandchild is related through females. The module should also include information on how Navajo conceptions of "household" differ from those of the

census and how enumerators should handle discussions of who should be listed as household residents on a census form.
Likewise, a special enumerator training module should be developed and tested for the Inupiat that would identify the common cultural practice of grandparents formally or informally adopting their grandchildren and advise enumerators on how to determine whether the adopted child category, or the grandchild (or other relative category) should be recorded on the form. The Inupiaq conceptions of "household" should also be addressed.

Special modules developed for the Navajo and Inupiaq might serve as starting templates for modules for other ethnic groups. The Navajo manual might serve as a starting template for modules of other matrilineal groups (six of the eight largest American Indian tribal groups are matrilineal, according to Blumberg) and perhaps patrilineal groups. The Inupiaq module could serve as a starting template for other Alaska Native tribes.

- **Plan and conduct targeted ethnographic research in other American Indian and Alaska Native tribal communities to identify cultural-specific factors that may affect the quality and comparability of data with other ethnic groups and develop enumerator training guidelines to address these factors.**

5.2.5. Recommendations for New Ethnographic Research Related to Coverage and Residence Rules

- **Plan and conduct ethnographic studies of household composition, residence rules, and coverage by race/ethnic groups in conjunction with the 2004 census tests in Queens, New York.** The Queens site is of particular interest for ethnographic studies concurrent with the site test enumeration because of its high concentration of Asians and Latinos of less-studied nationalities. It should be noted that the Korean study of complex households included in this report was done in Queens, and could be of direct use in planning for enumeration of Koreans and possibly other Asians in this 2004 test site. These concurrent studies might be done along the lines of the ethnographic studies of the behavioral causes of undercount research done in conjunction with the 1990 census. Ethnographic studies of household composition, coverage and residence rules by race/ethnic groups could also be done later in the decade, either in association with other tests or as stand-alone studies. The author is currently writing a proposal for this type of research in the context of the 2004 site test in Queens.

- **Develop and conduct research to identify and assess reasons persons in different ethnic groups and of different ages might be missed in both the census and in subsequent followup coverage studies to reduce correlation bias in coverage estimates.** The purpose would be to provide information that could help expand estimates of correlation bias to more race/ethnic groups and to women and children.

Recent research comparing counts from Census 2000 and the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation (A.C.E.) could only examine correlation bias (persons missed in both the Census and the A.C.E. and hence not included in dual estimations of coverage) for men who were black and non-black in some age categories (Waite, Kostanich and Long 2003). Mistrust of the government and fear of deportation, discussed above, would presumably lead to underreporting of immigrant women and children, as well as men. In this complex households study, we found evidence of underreporting of children among the Latinos that might have been related to fears of losing housing with strict limits on the number of permitted residents. Further, some Navajo respondents did not include some children on their census forms. This is not new: West and Robinson (1999) reported high undercounts for children in the 1990 Census: 13.8 percent of children in American Indian reservation households were estimated to be undercounted, as were 17.4 percent of Hispanic children in rural rental occupied units. Also, it appears that underreporting of children is not exclusively a problem with the U.S. Census. The same problem of undercounting children in the 2001 census was reported for England (Chambers, Brown and Diamond 2002) and in Australia according to Paul Williams and Patrick Corr of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (statement to Residence Rule Working Group on July 30, 2003).

- **Conduct research on Latino naming customs and what surnames they write on census forms to assess the extent to which Latinos vary in which surname they record on the last name line, and to identify possible effects of variation on matching and duplication and omission rates with non-Hispanics (this could be done on a bilingual Spanish-English form)**. Improvements might be made by adding more space for last name line or making other revisions to improve the accuracy and consistency of collecting Latino names.

- **Plan and conduct new research on persons who have more than one residence and/or more than one post office box to identify which residence they wish to be counted at and why.** In some cases, particularly among the Navajo and Inupiat, some household members leave their homes for the greater part of the year due to economic necessity but feel they should be counted at their reservation home, no matter how long they are gone.

  In other cases, some people may be in transitional situations with the intention to change their residence in the future and therefore may not consider themselves, or be considered by others in the household, to be household members who should be listed on a census form. This could be intentional, as is seen in this report with temporary Latino immigrants who were saving money to return to their home countries, or unintentional and situational, as with rural whites documented in this study who moved in temporarily with ailing relatives to provide care, but intend to move back to their own homes at some indefinite time in the future when the caregiving situation resolves in some way.

In other cases, people with more than one residence, or no clear residence, may make some rational calculation and decide which of their addresses is in their best interest to provide, given the data collection, its sponsor, its purpose, and/or the degree to which they trust the promise of confidentiality. Such rational decisions might concern gaining or maximizing benefits, as Tongue suggests, or minimizing losses of benefits or adverse outcomes such as being deported, or losing subsidized housing, as Kang, Holmes, and Blumberg/Goerman suggest. This might be found on household questionnaires, where a decision is made on who to list and who to omit, or on Be Counted forms, where a respondent could choose which of his/her addresses to list on the form.

6. REFERENCES CITED IN THIS REPORT

Ackerman, L. (2002). Flexible Residence in a Modern Indian Population. Submitted for Publication.

Ackerman, L. (1988). Residential Mobility among the Colville Indians. Ethnographic Coverage Evaluation of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Census Report #2. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Blumberg, R. (Forthcoming). Gender, Economy, and Kinship in Complex Households Among Six U.S. Ethnic Groups: Who Benefits? Whose Kin? Who Cares. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Blumberg, R. and Goerman, P. (2000). Family Complexity among Latino Immigrants in Virginia: An Ethnographic Study of their Households Aimed at Improving Census Categories. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Blumberg, R. and Goerman, P. (2000). Executive Summary: Family Complexity among Latino Immigrants in Virginia: An Ethnographic Study of their Households Aimed at Improving Census Categories. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Brownrigg, L. (1991). At Home in the Statistical Range: Rosters and Trends in Census Bureau Definitions of the Household. Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Society of Applied Anthropology in Charleston, South Carolina, March 16, 1991.

Bumpass, L. (1990). What's Happening to the Family? Interactions between Demographic and Institutional Change. Population Association of America Presidential Address. Demography, Vol. 27, No. 4. November, 1990.

Bumpass, L. and Raley, R.K. (1995). Redefining Single-Parent Families: Cohabitation and Changing Family Reality, in Demography, Vol. 32, No. 1, February, 1995.

Bumpass, L., Raley, R.K., and Sweet, J. (1995). The Changing Character of Stepfamilies: Implications of Cohabiting and Nonmarital Childbearing, in Demography, Volume 32, No. 3. August, 1995.

Burch, E. S. (1975). Eskimo Kinsmen: Changing Family Relationships in Northwest Alaska. American Ethnological Society Monograph 59. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Carrasco, L. (2003a). The American Community Survey (ACS) en Espanol: Results of Cognitive Interviews using the ACS Spanish Language Instrument. Census Bureau Report.

Carrasco, L. (2003b). Collecting Data from Spanish Speakers Using the ACS CAPI Instrument: Current Practices and Challenges." Census Bureau Report.

Carrasco, L. and Musquiz, M. M. (2003). Using Focus Groups to Improve Spanish Census Forms. Census Bureau report.

Casper, L. and Bianchi, S. (2002). Continuity and Change in the American Family. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.

Casper, L. and Bryson, K. (1998). Co-resident Grandparents and their Grandchildren: Grandparent Maintained Families. Population Division Working Paper No. 26. Suitland, Md.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Chambers, R. Brown, J. and Diamond, I. (2002). Methodology and Experience with the U.K. Post-Enumeration Program. Paper presented at the Joint Statistical Meetings of the American Statistical Association in New York City on August 11, 2002.

Chan, A. and Schwede, L. (2001). Within Household Coverage Error in Complex Households: A Qualitative Study on Ethnic and Racial Groups. Poster presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Association for Public Opinion Research Conference. May, 2001.

Chavira-Prado, A. (2001). Ethnographic Social Network Tracing among Mexican Former Migrant Farm Workers in the Midwest. Census 2000 Ethnographic Coverage Evaluation Report No. 3. June, 2001.

Coontz, S. (2001). Not Much Sense in those Census Stories, in The Washington Post. July 15, 2001.

Craver, A. (Forthcoming). Household Adaptive Strategies among the Inupiat. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Craver, A. (2000). Complex Inupiaq Eskimo Households and Relationships in Two Alaska Rural Communities. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Craver, A. (2000). Executive Summary: Complex Inupiaq Eskimo Households and Relationships in Two Alaska Rural Communities. Complex Households and Relationships in the

Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

de la Puente, M. (1993). Why are People Missed or Erroneously Included by the Census: A Summary of Findings from Ethnographic Reports. Proceedings of the 1993 Research Conference on Undercounted Ethnic Populations, pp 29-66.

Fields, J. and Casper, L. (2001). America's Families and Living Arrangements: Population Characteristics. Current Population Reports P20-537. U.S. Census Bureau. June, 2001.

Gerber, E. (1990). Calculating Residence: A Cognitive Approach to Household Membership Judgments among Low Income Blacks. U.S. Census Bureau. Center for Survey Methods Research Report.

Gerber, E. (1994). The Language of Residence: Respondent Understandings and Census Rules. Final report of the Cognitive Study of Living Situations. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Gerber, E. and Bates, N. (1994). Respondents' Understanding of Residence Terminology in Cognitive Research and in the Living Situation Survey. Published in the Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Research Conference. U.S. Census Bureau.

Goerman, P. (Forthcoming). Making Ends Meet: The Complex Household as a Temporary Survival Strategy among New Latino Immigrants to Virginia. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Hainer, P., Hines, C., Martin, E. and Shapiro, G. (1988). "Research on Improving Coverage in Household Surveys." Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Research Conference. U. S. Census Bureau.

Hewner, S. (2000). Ethnographic Research on Complex Households in Western New York: Impact of Migration and Economic Change on the Complexity of Household Composition among Rural Caucasians. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Hewner, S. (2000). Executive Summary: Ethnographic Research on Complex Households in Western New York: Impact of Migration and Economic Change on the Complexity of Household Composition among Rural Caucasians. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Hollmann, F.W., Mulder, T.J., and Kallan, J.E. (2000). "Methodology and Assumptions for the Population Projections of the United States: 1999-2100." Population Division Working Paper 38. U.S. Bureau of the Census, released on January 13, 2000.

Holmes, B. and Amissah, C. (2002). The Experiences of African American Households: A Kinship Study. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Holmes, B. (Forthcoming). African American Households in Transition: Structure, Culture and Self-Definition. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Hunter, J. (Forthcoming). Not the Typical Household: Whites in Rural New York. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Hunter, J., Schwede, L., and Aaker, E. (2003). Exploratory Research on a Person in Custodial Care Relationship Category Interval Census Report, July, 2003.

Kang, T. (2001). Complex Households among Korean-Americans and the Census. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Kang, T. (2001). Executive Summary. Complex Households among Korean-Americans and the Census. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Kang, T. (Forthcoming). Household Structure and its Social and Economic Functions among Korean American Immigrants in Queens, New York: An Ethnographic Study. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Kertzer, D. and Fricke, T. (1997). Anthropological Demography: Toward a New Synthesis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kreider, R. (2003). Adopted Children and Stepchildren: 2000. Census 2000 Special Report: CENSR-6. Census Bureau, August, 2003.

Lobo, S. (2003). American Urban Indian Mobility in the San Francisco Bay Area. Comparative Ethnographic Research on Mobile Populations Census 2000 Evaluation Report Supporting Document. Available from the Census Bureau.

Lugaila, T. (1992). Households, Families, and Children: A 30-year Perspective. U. S. Bureau of the Census current Population reports, P23-181. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. November, 1992.

Martin, E. (1998). Who Knows Who Lives Here? Within-Household Disagreements as a Source of Census Coverage Error. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association Section on Survey Research Methods.

Martin, E. (1996). Household Attachment and Survey Coverage. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association Section on Survey Research Methods.

Martin, E. and de la Puente, M. (1993). Research on Sources of Undercoverage within Households. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meetings.

Montoya (1992). Ethnographic Evaluation of the Behavioral Causes of Undercount: Woodburn, Oregon. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 25. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the University of Oregon. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Moynihan, D.P. (1965). The Negro Family: The Case for National Action (The Moynihan Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor Office of Policy, Planning, and Research.

Netting, R. McC., Wilk, R., and Arnould, E. 1984. Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Netting, R. McC., Wilk, R. and Arnould, E. (1984). Introduction, in Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nichols, E. and Schwede, L. (2002). CPS- and NHIS-Census Match Followup Study: Questionnaire Development, Cognitive Testing Results and Recommendations for Coverage Study Research. Internal Census Bureau Report issued July 17, 2002.

Pike, K. (1954). Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior, Part 1. Glendale, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Schmidley, A.D. (2003). The Foreign Born Population of the United States: March 2002. Current Population Reports P20-539. U.S. Census Bureau. February, 2003.

Schmidley, A.D. (2001). Profile of the Foreign Born Population of the United States: 2000. Current Population Reports Series P23-206. U.S. Census Bureau. Washington D.C.

Schwede, L. (2003). Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and In Ethnographic Studies in Six Race/Ethnic Groups. Executive-level briefing to Evaluations Executive Steering Committee on June 12, 2003.

Schwede, L. (1994). An Overview of Census Bureau Research on Household Composition and Living Situations. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association meetings. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Schwede, L. (1993). Household Composition and Census Coverage Improvement. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Meetings.

Schwede, L. (1993). An Empirical Exploration of Residence Rules: The Living Situation Survey. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association Section on Survey Research Methods.

Schwede, L. (1991). Family Strategies of Labor Allocation and Decision making in a Matrilineal, Islamic Society: The Minangkabau of West Sumatra, Indonesia. Cornell University Dissertation. University Microfilms International Dissertation Information Service, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Order No. 9113316.

Schwede, L. and Chan, A. (2001). Socio-Cultural Factors that may Affect the Quality of the Census. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meetings in Washington, D.C.

Schwede, L. and Chan, A. (2000). Complex Households in Selected Ethnic Groups and Implications for the U.S. Census: A Summary of Project Findings. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meetings in San Francisco, California.

Schwede, L., Chan, A., and Blumberg, R. (Forthcoming). Who Lives Here: Complex Ethnic Households in America. AltaMira Press.

Schwede, L., Chan, A., Blumberg, R., Goerman, P., Tongue, N., Craver, A., Kang, T., Hewner, S. (2000). Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies. Statistical Research Division Seminar Series session on September 7, 2000 in Census Headquarters in Suitland, MD. Videotape.

Schwede, L. And Ellis, Y. (1994). Exploring Associations Between Subjective and Objective Assessments of Household Membership. Presented at the Joint Statistical Meetings in Toronto, Canada. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association Section on Survey Methods Research.

Shapiro, G, Diffendal, G. and Cantor, D. (1993). Survey Undercoverage: Major Causes and New Estimates of Magnitude. Proceedings of the Annual Research Conference, U.S. Census Bureau.

Simmons, T. and O'Connell, M. (2003). Married Couple and Unmarried Partner Households: 2000. Census 2000 Special Reports CENSR-5. Population Division. U.S. Census Bureau. February, 2003.

Simmons, T. and O'Neill, G. (2001). Households and Families: 2000. Census 2000 Brief C2KBR/01-8. Issued September, 2001. U.S. Census Bureau.

Stack, C. (1974). All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community. New York: Harper and Row.

Sung, B. (1991) Behavioral Causes of Undercount in New York City's Chinatown. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Census Report # 6. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U. S. Census Bureau.

Sweet, E. (1994). Selected Statistics from the Living Situation Survey. Decennial Statistical Studies Division 2000 Census Memorandum series #H-16. Also available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division. U.S. Census Bureau.

Thompson, J. (1997). Memorandum for Robert W. Marx, Associate Director for Decennial Census, dated February 3, 1997. Census 2000 Decision Memorandum Number 8.

Tongue, N. (2000). Navajo Complex Households: Final Report to the U.S. Census Bureau. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Tongue, N. (2000). Executive Summary. Navajo Complex Households: Final Report to the U.S. Census Bureau. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Tongue, N. (Forthcoming). I Live Here and I Stay There: Navajo Perceptions of Households on the Reservation. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

2010 Planning Staff; Planning, Research and Evaluation Division. (1999). 2010 Census Planning and Testing Program: FY2000-FY2005. Draft document.

U.S. Census Bureau (2002). Appendix B: Definitions of Subject Characteristics, in Summary File 2: 2000 Census of Population and Housing Technical Documentation. SF2/04 (RV). June 2002.

U.S. Census Bureau. (July, 2002). U.S. Census Bureau Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008. Washington, D.C.

Waite, J., Kostanich, D. and Long, J. (2003). The Results of Research from A.C.E. Revision II and the Decision on Intercensal Population Estimates. Presented to the CNSTAT meeting on March 12 and in a Town Hall meeting at the Census Bureau on March 13, 2003.

Wallerstein, I. And Smith, J. (1991). Households as an Institution of the World Economy, in Gender, Family, and Economy: The Triple Overlap, edited by Rae Lesser Blumberg. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

West, K. and Robinson, J. G. (1999). What Do We Know About the Undercount of Children? Population Division Working Paper Number 39. U.S. Census Bureau. August, 1999.

Wilk, R. and Miller, S. (1997). Some Methodological Issues in Counting Communities and Households, in Human Organization, Vol. 56, No. 1.

Yanagisako, S. J. (1979). "Family and Household: the Analysis of Domestic Groups," in Annual Review of Anthropology 8:161- 205.

Year 2000 Research and Development Staff. (1992). "Barriers to Enumeration in the Census and Ways to Overcome Them." October 29, 1992 document. Copies available from Sandy Lucas in the Planning, Research and Evaluation Division (PRED). U.S. Census Bureau.

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE OF INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL QUESTION COLLECTING ALL INTERRELATIONSHIPS IN A HOUSEHOLD ON A MAILOUT CENSUS FORM: THE UNITED KINGDOM 2001 ENGLAND HOUSEHOLD FORM

Household Members and their Relationships within the Household

- The example below shows how to provide the relationship information for John Smith, his wife (Mary) and their three children (Alison, Steven and James).
- In this example Steven's (Person 4) relationship to Person 1 is son, to Person 2 is son and to Person 3 is brother.

Name of Person 1	Name of Person 2	Name of Person 3
First name JOHN	First name MARY	First name ALISON
Surname SMITH	Surname SMITH	Surname SMITH

ENTER NAME OF PERSON 1 ABOVE

Relationship of Person 2 to Person →	1
Husband or wife	☑
Partner	☐
Son or daughter	☐
Step-child	☐
Brother or sister	☐

Relationship of Person 3 to Person →	1	2
Husband or wife	☐	☐
Partner	☐	☐
Son or daughter	☑	☑
Step-child	☐	☐
Brother or sister	☐	☐

SPECIMEN

- Use the same order and person numbers as in Table 1 (page 2), starting with Person 1.
- Print the name of each household member in the space at the top of each column.
- ✔ a box to show the relationship of each person to each of the other members of your household.
- Include relationship information for household members who require an Individual Form for privacy reasons. Questions on the following pages should be left blank for these people.

Name of Person 1	Name of Person 2	Name of Person 3
First name	First name	First name
Surname	Surname	Surname

ENTER NAME OF PERSON 1 ABOVE

Relationship of Person 2 to Person →	1
Husband or wife	☐
Partner	☐
Son or daughter	☐
Step-child	☐
Brother or sister	☐
Mother or father	☐
Step-mother or step-father	☐
Grandchild	☐
Grandparent	☐
Other related	☐
Unrelated	☐

Relationship of Person 3 to Person →	1	2
Husband or wife	☐	☐
Partner	☐	☐
Son or daughter	☐	☐
Step-child	☐	☐
Brother or sister	☐	☐
Mother or father	☐	☐
Step-mother or step-father	☐	☐
Grandchild	☐	☐
Grandparent	☐	☐
Other related	☐	☐
Unrelated	☐	☐

Page 4 1134

APPENDIX B

"COMPLEX HOUSEHOLDS" ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY PROTOCOL

Section A: Pre-interview formalities[44]

1. Introduce yourself.

2. Give brief description of the study.

- *Example of what to say about the project:*

(*Modify as needed):* **"This is a study about [appropriate ethnic group] households and who lives or stays together. The Census Bureau wants to include all [appropriate ethnic group] people in the census, but currently misses some of them. This undercounting results in less federal money coming to your communities than you should be getting. To improve the count, the Census Bureau is sponsoring this research to better understand who lives or stays together.**"

- *(If respondent balks, say something like):* "**Your answers are important because we can only interview a small number of [appropriate ethnic group persons]. You represent other [appropriate ethnic group] people who are not being interviewed."**

- *Let them know you are not a Census Taker. Tell them that if they haven't sent in their census form, a census taker may come to visit them with a different type of interview.*

3. Have respondent complete the consent form and you add your signature. KEEP THIS FORM TO SEND IN.

- *Let Respondents know that answers are strictly confidential (under Title 13 law mentioned on consent form)*
- *Tapes will only be used by project staff and yourself, fewer than 5 people.*

---

[44] *Instructions to ethnographers are in italic print.* Questions you are to ask as is or modified are in regular enlarged, bold type, set off with quotation marks.

**4. START AUDIO-TAPE (you do NOT have to get approval on tape if you got the signed consent form).*

5. Summarize what will be done in the interview; answer questions.

<u>Section B: Completion of Census Form (let the tape continue to run)</u>

1. Filling in the census form

- *While the R is filling out the census form, you give encouragement and support, but politely refrain from helping the respondent with any questions in any way (to avoid your influencing their answers). If they keep asking for help, just say that they should give the answer they think is right for the question.*

- *Your role while the R is filling out the form is to observe his/her behavior, note any comments, questions or exclamations made by the respondent, and write down any skipped questions or those taken out of sequence. Include this information in your interview summary.*

- *Have respondent complete highlighted sections of the census form.* ***(Make sure the census form is highlighted, and question 1 has April 1 marked out and the word, "today" inserted.)***

Page 1	*Question 1*	*number of people living or staying*
Page 1	*Question 3*	*name of one of the persons who owns or rents this residence*
Page 2, person 2	*Question 1*	*Person 2's full name*
	Question 2	*Person's relationship to householder*
Page 2, person 3	*Question 1*	*Person 3's full name*
	Question 2	*Person's relationship to householder*
Page 3, person 4	*Question 1*	*Person 4's full name*
	Question 2	*Person's relationship to householder*
Page 3, person 5	*Question 1*	*Person 5's full name*
	Question 2	*Person's relationship to householder*
Page 4, person 6	*Question 1*	*Person 6's full name*

Question 2 Person's relationship to householder

IF THERE ARE MORE THAN 6 PERSONS IN THE HOUSEHOLD,

- *TAKE OUT A NEW CENSUS FORM AND START FILLING IN THE PERSON **2** COLUMN ON PAGE 2 FOR PERSON 7 (You skip to person 2, because person 1, question 2 doesn't ask for relationship)*

Section C. Ethnographic interviewing:

- *Using the demographics sheet, ethnographers collect on their own, during the interview, the following data for EACH PERSON who lives or currently stays in the household:*

Sex
Age and date of birth
Ethnicity (e.g., Spanish/Hispanic/Latino)
Race
Marital status (over 15 only)
Highest education completed
Type of employment
Place of birth (If in U.S., go to section D)
In what year did you first come to the U.S.?
Have you lived continuously in the U.S. since then? (If yes, go to Section D)
When did you last come to live in the U.S.?

Section D: History of changes in the household since Census Day

1a. What are the names of all of the people you listed on this census form?

1b. "Who of the people you listed were also here in this household on or about April 1?" (*Amy asks about March 1).*

1c. "Who was NOT living or staying in this household on or about April 1?" *(Amy asks about March 1)*

1d. (*If appropriate, Probe***): "Anyone else?"**

2a. "Are there any people who were living or staying here on or about April 1 who are no longer living in this household?"

(If no, skip to the next section. If yes, ask the following questions, as appropriate)

2b. "Who is no longer living or staying in this household?"

3a. "Where (has he/she, have they) gone [e.g., John's house, Mercy Hospital]?"

3b. "Why did (he/she, they) leave here?"

3c. "How long (has he/she, have they) been gone?"

3d. "(Is this person, Are these persons) expected to come back here to live or stay in the next six months?"

3e. "Does this person usually live here or usually live someplace else? *(If here, skip to 3g)*

3f. (If elsewhere): "Where (does he/she, do they) usually live?"

3g. "Did you list this person on this census form as living or staying here?"

(*NOTE in the summary any patterns of movement back-and-forth or among places)*

<u>Section E. Questions about periods of movements for this ethnic group</u>

1. "Is there a time of year when [appropriate ethnic group] people move around a lot?"

2. (If yes): "When do they move around a lot?"

3. (If yes to 1): "Why do [ethnic group] people move a lot then?"

<u>Section F: Discussion about R's answers and probing for people to include or possibly to omit</u>

This is an open-ended section. See Attachment A for example questions on how to probe for additional people to include.

- *The objectives of this section are to*
  - *learn more about who really lives or stays in the household and*
  - *identify any additional people the R did not include on the form who should have been included.*

- *Each interviewer uses his/her own questions. (We'll be very interested to learn about the types of questions you ask, in which order, and what you find does and doesn't work in eliciting this information about who should really be included in the household, according to both the etic residence rules (in your blue folder) and according to your opinion as an ethnographer.*

- *Ask for the demographic information on the demographic sheet for each new person who should have been included on the census form, according to the census residence rules.*

<u>Section G: Respondent and official census form</u>

Ask the following questions:

1. **"Did someone in your household receive the actual official census form in the mail or from a person other than myself? (Show them both the short and long forms)?"**

2. **"Did someone write in the answers on that official form?" (***If no: go to q. 4)*

3. **"Who wrote in answers on the official form? (***Skip to 5)*

4. **"Why didn't anyone write in answers on that form?" (***Skip to Q. 8) section)*

5. **"Did someone in your household mail it back?" (***If no, skip to Q. 7)*

6. **"About when was the census form mailed back?" (***Skip to Q. 8)*

7. **"Why didn't someone mail it back?"**

8. **"If you have any comments on how the Census Bureau could improve the timing or method of collecting census data from (appropriate ethnic group), please share them with me."**

Section H: The Relationship Grid

- *Fill in the relationship grid at this time, asking for the EXACT relationship (e.g., biological mother, adopted son, foster daughter, etc.). If there is an emic category given by the respondent, write that in the block at the TOP of the box. State the etic relationship term (from the census form) it is closest to in the BOTTOM part of the box.*

- *Be sure to include in your summary a discussion of any differences in etic and emic relationship terms you found.*

Section I: Respondents' beliefs and vocabulary

A. *Probe to learn about respondents' beliefs about who should be included as part of a household.*

B. Elicit native concepts and words to describe attachments to households and what they mean for membership.

C. [Introduction]: "In different cultures, people may have different meanings for relationship terms. The Census Bureau people are interested in finding out if different cultural groups interpret some of the relationship words on the census form differently. For example, in some cultures, people consider someone other than a biological mother to also be a mother. In the next questions, I'm interested in how you as a/an [appropriate ethnic group person] and other people in your culture would define certain relationship terms."

D. Ask for EACH of the relationship terms A to S below:

1. "How would you and other people in your culture define the word [relationship term, such as 'mother']?"

2. "Do you use this term for anyone in your household or family?" (*If no, skip to next relationship term.)*

3. "Do you use this term for anyone else in your household or family?" (*If no, skip to next relationship term)*

4. (IF YES): "Who else do you call [relationship term, such as 'mother']?"

(*The purpose of this is to find out if the R is using the relationship term to apply to someone unexpected. It is not to get a list of all of the sons and daughters, for example, who live there).*

5. Would you mark this person as a [relationship term] on the census form?

- ***Ask questions 1-5 above for relationship terms A-S:***

  A. "Mother"

  B. "Father"

  C. "Grandfather"

  D. "Grandmother"

  E. "Spouse"

  F. "Husband"

  G. "Wife"

  H. "Son"

  I. "Daughter"

  J. "Sister"

  K. "Brother"

  L. "Aunt"

  M. "Uncle"

  N. "Foster parent"

  O. "Foster child"

  P. "Adoptive parent"

  Q. "Adopted child"

  R. "Step-parent"

S. "Step-child"

5. "What does this mean to you: 'live' in a place?"

6. **"What does this mean to you: 'stay' in a place?"**

7. "What does the word "household" mean to you?

<u>Section J. Vignettes to differentiate "relative" and "nonrelative" (such as fictive kin) in your ethnic group:</u>

Add one or two vignettes that cover a fictive relative situation that can occur within your own ethnic group and try to get the relationship term that the person would be called (such as "cousin"). Here is an example I drew up (Rae and Patti, PLEASE help if this example is not right.)

> *Jose came to this country 2 months ago from El Salvador to find work . He is living with Maria and her husband in Virginia and pays them some money for the room. He is not a blood relative, but he is the son of Maria's godfather and he comes from the same village they came from.*
>
> *Would you consider Jose to be a relative of Maria?*
>
> *(If yes): What would you call this relative?*

<u>Section K: Assessment of the social and economic functioning of the households</u>

- ***Social functioning will be in terms of:***

  1. *Division of labor by sex, age*

  - *Type of tie to household (e.g., lives there, eats there, boards there, has a room there, contributes money, etc.). For this objective, ethnographers may explore ties of persons outside this household to this household.*

  - *Use your own questions to get at these topics*

- ***Economic functioning will be in terms of the following types of questions. (You can modify or add to these questions).***

A question asked of the respondent about how the household is doing economically, such as the general one below.

1. "How well would you say your household is doing economically?"

- *You can ask any followup indicators you think will work with your ethnic group to try to figure out which qualitative economic level to put them in. Some examples that may or may not be appropriate to your own situation include "Does everyone in this household have enough to eat? "Do you have money to buy enough warm clothes in the winter?" "Can you afford to buy a new car (or pickup)?*

2a. "Does anyone have to leave this household for a period of time to work elsewhere?"

2b. (If yes), "How many days is this person gone from here to the work area?"

2c. (If yes to 2a), "What type of work does this person do?"

***3*. "Which persons in the household earn money?"**

4. "What does each person do to earn money?"

5. "About what part of total household income does each person contribute to the household?

- *A qualitative measure of the economic well-being of the whole household on a scale of low low, low, low average, average, high average, and high, compared to households in the whole country.*

<u>Section L: Reasons for living in a complex household</u>

Ask questions along the following lines (rephrasing to fit your situation and the respondent would be good here)

1. Why do you live in a complex household? (*rephrase to fit your situation)*

2. Do you expect to continue living with these people for quite awhile? (*If yes, skip to question 3)*

2a. (*If no):* With whom will you live when you leave here?

2b. Where is that?

3. If you could live however you want, who would you live with?

Section M: End interview, pay respondent $35, and get signed voucher (VERY IMPORTANT)

Appendix C

Ethnographic Coverage Reports in Conjunction with the 1990 Decennial Census: Ethnographic Evaluation of the Behavioral Causes of Census Undercount Project

Ammar, N. (1992). Coverage Differences in a Mixed Neighborhood in Hartford, Connecticut. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 21. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Institute for Community Research. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Aschenbrenner, J. (1989a). Coverage Undercount in a Black Neighborhood in St. Louis. Ethnographic Coverage Evaluation of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal: Report #6. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Aschenbrenner, J. (1991). A Community-Based Study of the 1990 Census Undercount in a Racially Mixed Area. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 1. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Bell, P. (1991). Residential Patterns in a Rural Black Community. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 4. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Oklahoma State University. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Bracken, K. and de Bango, G. (1992). Hispanics in a Racially and Ethnically Mixed Neighborhood in the Greater Metropolitan New Orleans Area. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 16. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Hispaniad '87, Inc. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Bunte, P. and Joseph, R. (1992). The Cambodian Community of Long Beach: An Ethnographic Analysis of Factors Leading to Census Undercount. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 9. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with United Cambodian Community, Inc. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Darden, J. (1992). Ethnographic Evaluation of the Behavioral Causes of Undercount in a Black Ghetto of Flint, Michigan. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Michigan State University. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Dominguez, B. and Mahler, S. (1993). Alterative Enumeration of Undocumented Mexicans in South Bronx. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Columbia University. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Duany, J. (1992) The Census Undercount, the Underground Economy, and Undocumented Migration: The Case of Dominicans in Santurce, Puerto Rico. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 17. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the University of the Sacred Heart. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Durant, T. and Jack, L. (1993). Undercount of Black Inner City Residents of New Orleans, Louisiana. Conducted under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Louisiana State University. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Frate, D. (1993). The Causes of Census Undercount Among Rural Blacks in Central Mississippi. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the University of Mississippi. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Garcia, V. (1992). Results from an Alternative Enumeration in a Mexican and Mexican American Farm Worker Community in California. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 12. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Guadelupe Community Health Center. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Hamid, A. (1992). Ethnographic Follow-up of a Predominantly African American Population in a Sample Area in Central Harlem, New York City. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 11. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Isberner, F. (1992). The Bicentennial Census of a Mixed Neighborhood in Carbondale, Illinois. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 19. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Jojola, T. (1992). Census Ethnographic Research Project: Isleta Pueblo, New Mexico. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 23. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the University of New Mexico at Albuquerque. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Kang, T. (1992) Ethnography of Alternative Enumeration among Korean Americans in Queens, New York. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 15. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Research Foundation of the State University of New York on Behalf of SUNY at Buffalo. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Kim, Eun-Young. (1991). Koreatown, Los Angeles Alternative Enumeration. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 5. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Korean Youth Center. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Lerch, P. (1992). Coverage Differences in the Census of a Rural Minority Community in North Carolina: The Little Branch Area of the Waccamaw Sioux Tribe. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 20. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Mahler, S. (1993). Alternative Enumeration of Undocumented Salvadorans on Long Island. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Columbia University. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Montoya, D. M. (1992). Ethnographic Evaluation of the Behavioral Causes of Undercount: Woodburn, Oregon. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 25. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the University of Oregon. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Moore, J. (1992). Determine Extent of Census Undercounting Among Certain Rural Creek Indians of Oklahoma: Coverage Evaluation Report for the U.S. Census Bureau. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 10. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the University of Oklahoma. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Rodriguez, N. and Hagan, J. (1991). Investigating Census Coverage and Content Among the Undocumented: An Ethnographic Study of Latino Immigrant Tenants in Houston. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 3. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the University of Houston. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Romero, M. (1992). Ethnographic Evaluation of Behavioral Causes of Census Undercount of Undocumented Immigrants and Salvadorans in the Mission District of San Francisco, California. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 18. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the San Francisco State University Foundation. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Rynearson, A. and Gosebrink, T. (1992). Asian Americans in a Mixed Neighborhood: A Longitudinal Study. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 14. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the International Institute of St. Louis. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Shaw, T. and Guthrie, P. (1992). An Alternative Enumeration of a Heterogeneous Population in a San Francisco Housing Project. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 13. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Telegraph Hill Neighborhood Association. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Stepick, A. and Stepick, C. (1992). Alternative Enumeration of Haitians in Miami, Florida. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 8. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with Florida International University. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Straus, T. A. (1991). The Bicentennial Census in a Mixed Neighborhood in Chicago. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 2. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Native American Educational Services College. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Sung, B. L. (1991) Behavioral Causes of Undercount in New York City's Chinatown. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 6. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the City University of New York Foundation on behalf of City College of New York. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Velasco, A. (1992). Ethnographic Evaluation of the Behavioral Causes of Undercount in the Community of Sherman Heights, California. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 22. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Chicano Federation of San Diego County. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Wingerd, J. (1992). Urban Haitians: Documented/Undocumented in a Mixed Neighborhood. Ethnographic Evaluation of the 1990 Decennial Census Report # 7. Prepared under a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Community Service Council of Broward County, Inc. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Wobus, P. (1992). Identifying Barriers to Census Enumeration of Asians Using Ethnographic and Behavioral Data. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting in Pittsburgh, PA.

Appendix D

References from the Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Project

Blumberg, R. (Forthcoming) Gender, Economy, and Kinship in Complex Households among Six U.S. Ethnic Groups: Who Benefits? Whose Kin? Who Cares? in "Who Lives Here?" Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Blumberg, R. and Goerman, P. (2000). Family Complexity among Latino Immigrants in Virginia: An Ethnographic Study of their Households Aimed at Improving Census Categories. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Blumberg, R. and Goerman, P. (2000). Executive Summary: Family Complexity among Latino Immigrants in Virginia: An Ethnographic Study of their Households Aimed at Improving Census Categories. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Chan, A. (Forthcoming). The Way We Live: Complex Ethnic Households. Chapter 1 in "Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Chan, A. and Schwede, L. (2001). Within Household Coverage Error in Complex Households: a Qualitative Study on Ethnic and Racial Groups. Poster presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Annual Meetings.

Craver, A. (Forthcoming). Household Adaptive Strategies among the Inupiat. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Craver, A. (2000). Complex Inupiaq Eskimo Households and Relationships in Two Alaska Rural Communities. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Craver, A. (2000). Executive Summary: Complex Inupiaq Eskimo Households and Relationships in Two Alaska Rural Communities. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Goerman, P. (Forthcoming). Making Ends Meet: The Complex Household as a Temporary Survival Strategy among New Latino Immigrants to Virginia. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Hewner, S. (2000). Ethnographic Research on Complex Households in Western New York: Impact of Migration and Economic Change on the Complexity of Household Composition among Rural Caucasians. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Hewner, S. (2000). Executive Summary: Ethnographic Research on Complex Households in Western New York: Impact of Migration and Economic Change on the Complexity of Household Composition among Rural Caucasians. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Holmes, B. (Forthcoming). African American Households in Transition: Structure, Culture and Self-Definition. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Holmes, B. and Amissah, C. (2002). The Experiences of African American Households: A Kinship Study. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Holmes, B. and Amissah, C. (2002). Executive Summary: The Experiences of African American Households: A Kinship Study. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Hunter, J. (Forthcoming). Not the Typical Household: Whites in Rural New York. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Kang, T. (2001). Complex Households among Korean-Americans and the Census. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Kang, T. (2001). Executive Summary. Complex Households among Korean-Americans and the Census. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Kang, T. (Forthcoming). Household Structure and its Social and Economic Functions among Korean American Immigrants in Queens, New York: An Ethnographic Study. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Schwede, L. (Forthcoming). Complex Ethnic Households in America Concluding Chapter in "Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America. Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Schwede, L. (2003). Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and In Ethnographic Studies in Six Race/Ethnic Groups. Executive-level briefing to Evaluations Executive Steering Committee on June 12, 2003.

Schwede, L. and Chan, A. (2001). Socio-Cultural Factors that may Affect the Quality of the Census. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meetings in Washington, D.C.

Schwede, L. and Chan, A. (2000). Complex Households in Selected Ethnic Groups and Implications for the U.S. Census: A Summary of Project Findings. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meetings in San Francisco, California.

Schwede, L., Chan, A., and Blumberg, R. (Forthcoming). Who Lives Here: Complex Ethnic Households in America. AltaMira Press.

Schwede, L., Chan, A., Blumberg, R., Goerman, P., Tongue, N., Craver, A., Kang, T., Hewner, S. (2000). Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies. Statistical Research Division Seminar Series session on September 9, 2000 in Census Headquarters in Suitland, MD. Videotape.

Tongue, N. (Forthcoming). I Live Here and I Stay There: Navajo Perceptions of Households on the Reservation. In Who Lives Here?: Complex Ethnic Households in America, eds. L. Schwede, A. Chan, and R. Blumberg. AltaMira Press.

Tongue, N. (2000) Navajo Complex Households: Final Report to the U.S. Census Bureau. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

Tongue, N. (2000) Executive Summary. Navajo Complex Households: Final Report to the U.S. Census Bureau. Complex Households and Relationships in the Decennial Census and in Ethnographic Studies Final Ethnographic Report. Available from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.