ETHNOGRAPHIC EXPLORATORY RESEARCH
REPORT SERIES
(#2007-1)

Missing Men:
A Comparative Methodological Study of Underenumeration and Related Problems

Charles A. Valentine
Betty Lou Valentine

The Brookdale Hospital Center, Brooklyn NY

Citation: Charles A. Valentine and Betty Lou Valentine. 1971. *Missing Men: A Comparative Methodological Study of Underenumeration and Related Problems.* Report prepared under contract for the U.S. Census Bureau. Washington, D.C.

Report Issued: October 23, 2007

Valentine Contract #1510

Ref: Page 8

M I S S I N G M E N

A Comparative Methodological Study of Underenumeration and Related Problems

Charles A. Valentine

Betty Lou Valentine

1971

1. Methods and Data 1

2. Sources of Error 12

3. Interpretations and Implications 22

4. A Proposed Solution 34

Table 1. Comparative Data from Observation and Interviews 40
Table 2. Characteristics and Coverage of Households 41
Table 3. Persons Recorded in Interviews but Not Observed 45

Abbreviations 46

References Cited 47

1. Methods and Data

Much interest and attention have recently been focused on census underenumeration, particularly undercounts of poor urban minority populations (Hear 1968, Trans-action 1968). As an outgrowth of this concern, the work reported here is part of a joint study by the authors and the Center for Research in Measurement Methods. Our purpose is to compare the results of interview-survey research with data produced by the participant-observational method of ethnography and cultural anthropology. We believe this comparison will be revealing with respect to the usefulness of questionnaire interview techniques, the accuracy of basic social statistics on poor minority urbanites, and the validity of both theories and policies based on these statistics.

The central procedure of this research has been a double-blind comparison of data collected by the two methods from the same sample population. Since mid-1968 the two authors have been carrying out a resident ethnographic study of the predominantly Afro-American inner-city community which we refer to as Blackston (Valentine and Valentine 1970a, 1970b, 1971a). During the summer of 1969 the Research Center sent CPS, HIS, and QHS survey interviewers to 33 dwelling units in a section of this community which we have been studying intensively. The interviewers were unaware of our work. The Center identified for us the dwelling units surveyed, but we received no data from the interviews. Before, during, and since the period of interviewing we have been observing the households covered in the surveys, along with a much larger number of other households. In 1970 we completed a preliminary report for the Center detailing the ethnographic findings as of the time when the interviews were carried out (Valentine and Valentine 1970c). We have since received the data

tabulated by the interviewers, which makes possible the following comparison.

For convenience and confidentiality the dwelling units surveyed are numbered 1 through 33. It is typical of housing conditions in Blackston that 6 of these units (#4, 7, 8, 18, 24, and 30) constituting nearly 20% of the original sample were vacant, most of them being demolished, burnt out, or otherwise uninhabitable. All of these structures were correctly recorded by the interviewers as unoccupied or unfit for habitation. These units are therefore excluded from the sample for comparison. One dwelling unit (#33) was incorrectly identified by interviewers as a household. The premises in this case were occupied by a single elderly woman who was actually a lodger with a family who lived in the same building but was not covered in the survey. This individual was thus a member of the unsurveyed household, according to Census Bureau definitions (U.S.Bureau 1968:3, 1970:41). Accordingly, she is eliminated from the comparison sample. One unit which appears to have been a genuine household (#6) has also had to be dropped from the comparative analysis. This family lived in the area only very briefly, just at the time of the interviews, and is unknown even to immediate neighbors. Consequently there is not sufficient ethnographic information on this household to include it in the comparison.

Thus eight units altogether among those surveyed by census personnel are excluded for purposes of comparative analysis. Since most of the eliminated units were uninhabited, this is a net exclusion of only 4 individual persons from the total enumerated by the interviewers. Each of the remaining 25 dwelling units covered in the surveys is matched by ethnographic household data. Household #1 was not at first identifiable to us because the premises

specified in the initial identification are not a residential dwelling. Upon inspection of the survey data, however, it became clear that this was a case of interviewers mislocating a family that actually lives at another address. We have included this family in the present comparison. None of the other households recorded by the interviewers presented any difficulties of identification. In short, the basic sample was selected by normal census survey techniques, and we have made only such minor alterations as are imposed by the data or required by the logic of methodological comparison.

The comparison sample which emerges from the foregoing considerations consists of 153 individuals living in 25 households located in a single city block. Both the sample population and the number of households are approximately three-quarters Afro-American and one-fourth Hispano-American. Two individuals in the sample held low-level white collar jobs at the time of the interviews. All other employment is in blue collar occupations, most of them low-skilled and poorly paid. Accurate income data are extremely difficult to obtain and even more difficult to interpret. Preliminary ethnographic evidence suggests, however, that most weekly household incomes from all monetary sources are below $200, at least a third are under $150, and a smaller proportion are less than $100.

These tentative figures must be understood in the context that the metropolitan area surrounding Blackston has one of the highest cost of living in the nation. The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently determined that in this area in the spring of 1970 a "moderate" level of living for a family of four required a gross annual income of over $12,000, which is nearly $250 per week; the income required for a "lower level" budget was set at $7,000 annually, which approaches

$150 weekly. With one exception, all households known to be receiving $200 per week or more are significantly larger than the BLS four-person unit; typically they are multi-family households or extended families with two or more members who are employed at least part time. Moreover, the prices of necessities such as food and clothing are artificially inflated in the local community to an average of roughly 25% above prices charged in surrounding middle-class, Euro-American communities within the same metropolitan area (Valentine and Valentine 1970b:24-27; cf. Caplovitz 1963). Thus while gross income is not as low as in some poverty areas, the per capita value of expendable resources remains low indeed. All these families live in substandard housing, much of it at least intermittently lacking even basic facilities. In all these respects the sample is representative of the community as a whole. The community itself is a typical poly-ethnic inner-city slum.

Table 1 presents the highlights of congruence and contrast between data from the two sources. It can be seen that the comparison indicates the census surveys produced an undercount amounting to 17% of the ethnographically defined sample population. This magnitude of overall underenumeration is more than twice as high as the 8.2% error which official estimates suggest was the level of net understatement reached in the national census of nonwhites by 1967 (Siegel 1968:25,41). While the two sets of data from Blackston show discrepancies within all age and sex categories, by far the major difference applies to males 19 years of age and older. Ethnographic evidence indicates that 61% of these adult males actually residing in the sample households were not recorded by the interviewers. This is a level of underenumeration that is more than triple the highest rate of net understatement for <u>any</u> age group

among nonwhite males (20.1% at age 30-34) suggested on a national basis by the same authoritative source cited above. The local surveys make it appear that over 70% of the adult population are women, but ethnographic observation produced a sex ratio very close to 1:1.

When the two bodies of evidence are analysed in terms of household composition, the contrasts are even more striking. The interview surveys found that 72% of the Blackston sample households were headed by women. This is roughly three times as high as national proportions recently published for the Negro population (U.S. Bureau 1967a:3, 1967b:69, 71). for urban poverty areas (U.S. Bureau 1966:2), and in secondary sources emphasizing the prevalence of female family heads among Afro-Americans (e.g. Moynihan 1965, 1966) or highlighting fatherlessness among the poor in general (e.g. Hurley 1969:76f). Yet the ethnographic evidence indicates that no more than 12% of the Blackston households were headed by women. This figure not only departs widely from the results of both local and national surveys of Blacks and other minorities, but it also compares favorably with national figures on low-income Whites (U.S. Bureau 1967b:71). Locally it appears that the 1969 surveys underestimated the incidence of male-headed households by 68%. It may be noted that all the female-headed domiciles in the sample are Afro-American, not Hispano-American. Nevertheless, 83% of the Afro-American households are headed by men.

More detailed analysis can be facilitated by reference to Table 2 which presents the ethnographic data by households. Clearly the principal discrepancies to be accounted for concern the 17 adult males who have been observed in the ethnographic research but were not recorded in the survey interviews, as well as any other men heading domiciles where they may have been mistakenly

assigned to some category other than household heads. Thirteen of the missing men are unreported heads of households (# 1, 2, 3, 5, 11, 12, 13. 14, 19, 20, 25, 27, 32). Two additional men heading households were enumerated but misrecorded as a "brother" or "friend" of the senior woman in the domicile (#16, 26). Taken together these two sets of males make up the 15 household heads who do not appear in the survey records. In each of the last two households mentioned (# 16, 26) there is also one additional adult male member whose presence was not recorded by the interviewers. These last two missing men are the unreported brother and son, respectively of the eldest woman in household 20. This same household also has one of the two adult women not listed in the survey results, a grown daughter. The second missing woman is another grown daughter in domicile 27. The remaining few individuals absent from the interview records consist mainly of adolescent males (e.g. 2 in household 21) and a scattering of young children (mainly the offspring of the unrecorded women in dwelling units 20 and 27).

The crux of the comparison is the 17 men missing from the interview data, plus the two misclassified male household heads. In order to interpret the meaning of these discrepancies, we must specify the observed behavior and relationships of these individuals within the relevant domestic groups. The situation can also be further clarified by comparing the roles of these men with the behavior of others related to domiciles in contrasing ways. It must first be noted, however, that the census concept of household head involves a certain degree of ambiguity. The head of a household is officially defined as the "household member reported as head by respondent," but the same source also specifies that when a woman living with her husband reports herself as

head the husband should be classified as the head of the domicile (U.S. Bureau 1970:40). While these definitions are part of the instructions given to enumerators, they do not appear to take into account the possibility that female respondents may omit males who would otherwise be classified as domicile heads. Nevertheless, the essence of the intended meaning seems clear enough: if a senior male occupying a husband-father status resides in the domestic unit he is its head.

Fifteen of the 17 missing or mislabeled men are functional household heads in terms of this definition. At the time of interviewing, each of these men resided and had been regularly residing for some time as the senior male of the domicile. They all contributed to financial support, and in the majority of cases theirs was the principal contribution. They took part in domestic decisions and shared in child rearing. The senior couples in 9 of these domestic groups (# 1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 27, 32) were legally married, while the other 6 were in common-law unions (# 11, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26). Thirteen of these unions remain intact today, approaching two years since the surveys. Two have been dissolved by separation (households 16 and 19). Because the latter two unions seemed less stable than the others, we tentatively classified these two households as female-headed in the preliminary report of ethnographic findings (Valentine and Valentine 1970c). Subsequent reflection has convinced us, however, that this was an error for two main reasons. First, the appearance of instability was at least partly a matter of hindsight after the fact of separation. Secondly, the question of permanence beyond the date of survey cannot be taken into account in interview procedures, and the two domiciles in question would certainly have been classified in the census records as headed by males

if the senior men had been recorded accurately. Moreover, the woman of household 19 has since married another man. This and other important post-enumeration changes within the sample (e.g. the deaths of the heads of households 10 and 28, and a divorce in household 5) must not be considered by the terms of the comparison.

Another pattern of relationships between men and domestic groupings which is quite significant in Blackston also poses analytical problems. This is the whole class of cases in which men behave as household members (and sometime heads) in all the ways previously discussed, except that they do not reside regularly or continuously in the relevant domiciles. None of these individuals appear in the interview records, and we have decided that it is in keeping with census practice to exclude them from the ethnographic comparison sample. One reason for this decision is that if the surveys had been part of a complete census, some of these men would probably have been counted elsewhere. (If they were taken into account in the comparison, of course, the extent of the undercount in this age and sex category would be even greater than it is.)

Nevertheless, the picture of both domestic and community life remains quite incomplete without some attention to these relationships. These considerations are by no means confined to transients or persons without fixed abode. Household 22 affords a striking example, for two men maintain stable non-resident relations with this domestic group. The husband of the household head lives nearby with another family, but he regularly visits his wife and children, helps with their material support, takes part in disciplining the children and making family decisions, and is available for help at almost any time. The husband of the second daughter in this family has been stationed overseas in

military service for some time, but he contributes income regularly and participates in the household whenever his situation allows him to visit. In addition to such cases, there are a number of men who are sufficiently unattached or intermittent in their domestic affiliations so that it would be doubtful to assign them to any particular domicile. Despite their transitoriness, the relationships of these men to domestic units, including some units in our sample, are not insignificant. In their comings and goings they return repeatedly to the same households where they reactivate ties of kinship, friendship, and sexuality. When they are present they may fulfill some or all the domestic functions discussed earlier.

If all these relationships, plus certain individual factors, could be taken into account, the picture conveyed by the surveys that virtually three quarters of the women and children live without male companionship or support would disappear entirely. Household 22, just discussed, is female-headed in no more than a technical sense which does not reflect behavioral reality very well. The head of household 21 is a young widow who lost her husband in an auto accident a few months before the interviews, and there is little reason to assume that she will remain unmarried indefinitely. Of all the units in our sample, only household 17 with a woman past 40 at its head, really seems to be a chronically or permanently female-headed domicile. Thus on close acquaintance the image of ruling matrifocality or rampant matriarchy diminishes toward the vanishing point. Nevertheless, the logic of comparability appears to require that these last three households be classified as female-headed for present purposes.

The purpose of these analytical decisions is twofold. We are attempting

to conceptualize the ethnographic findings in a manner as consistent as possible with routine census categories and procedures. At the same time, we intend to state the existence and relationships of uncounted individuals in a way that is conservative with respect to the ruling question of methodological comparison. Taking these considerations into account, there can be little doubt that the indicated contrasts between the two bodies of data reflect actual differences in enumeration rather than problems of definition or classification. The underenumeration resulting from survey interviews is quite extensive and highly selective. Respondents in a substantial majority of the sample households (64%) did not report adult male members, with the result that more than two-thirds (68%) of all domiciles actually headed by men were wrongly recorded as female-headed, while considerably over half (61%) of the adult men actually in residence were missed by the interviewers.

One further dimension of contrast between the sets of data collected by the two approaches is shown in Table 3. Here are 2 adults and 6 children who appear in the lists compiled by the census enumerators but were not found by the ethnographers to belong to any household in the sample. All of these 8 persons were actually residing in other domiciles elsewhere at the time of the interviews, but their household membership was erroneously reported for reasons that will be explained in the next section. In a strictly numerical sense, of course, this small set of individuals could be interpreted as reducing slightly the extent of the undercount described above. For present purposes, however, it seems reasonable to reject this interpretation as essentially mechanical and not representating the social realities. The individuals involved here are therefore not represented in Tables 1 and 2. To have included

them in those comparisons would have had the effect of masking a part of the underenumeration.

The ethnographic research has produced additional evidence which helps to establish a wider context for the small sample used in the methodological comparison. Thus far in the wider study of Blackston we have analysed data on household composition from a total of 132 dwelling units, including 633 individuals. The distribution of salient relevant characteristics in this larger sample is turning out to be closely similar to the patterns outlined in Tables 1 and 2. These findings further strengthen our conviction that the comparison sample adequately represents the community as a whole.

Some further evidence is available from a comparable but quite independent study recently completed in a similar area with a Puerto Rican population (Harwood 1970). The anthropologist responsible for this work used a modified ethnographic approach to study household structure and compared his results with census data for the same population. The one major difference between his approach and ours was that he and his coworkers did not live in the community under study but resided and actively maintained major ties elsewhere. The census enumerators found 68% of the households in this Puerto Rican population to be female-headed. The non-resident ethnographic method, on the other hand, found that 62% of the households were headed by men. Another finding of this ethnography was that 29% of all males over the age of 20 were missed by the census. The Blackston experience suggests to us that a fulltime resident-participant approach would probably have produced an undercount of greater size.

2. Sources of Error

We the ethnographers were not present during any of the Blackston census interviews except those which enumerated our own household. We have observed many similar interactions in this community, however, and collected sufficient additional data to feel quite confident that we understand the sources of error. In specifying these it is convenient to begin with the few instances of overenumeration summarized in Table 3 and described near the end of the last section. As it happens, the cases of these three domiciles have the simplest explanations for misreporting.

These are all cases in which the interviewers and the respondents were unwittingly proceeding from different assumptions about the nature and limits of the unit to be enumerated. Different implicit definitions of the concept household led to unrecognized misunderstanding. In household 17, the respondent and her 3 children actually belong to another domicile in a neighboring part of the community. They happened to be visiting briefly in household 17 at the time of the interview. Here the phrase "all persons staying here" which appears in the interview instructions, plus the fact that the visitor herself happened to be selected as respondent, probably led to the errors. The extra individual in the interview record for household 19 has been living in an institution for some five years. In household 32 one of the reported but unobserved persons definitely lives in Puerto Rico, and the same is probably true of the other two. (Of all the domestic groups in the comparison sample this happens to be the one with which we have had least contact and therefore know least well.) Thus in both household 19 and 32 it is clear that the mothers who were the respondents reported all their offspring, rather than limiting their lists to actual members of the resident domestic group. Since both these

respondents are middle-aged Hispano-Americans whose English is quite limited, linguistic difficulties presumably contributed to the misunderstandings.

Turning now to the much more numerous cases in which resident members of Blackston domestic groups were not recorded by the enumerators, it will be useful to employ a recent categorization of error sources in underenumeration.

> There are two ways in which people can be missed in a census. One occurs when a building, apartment, or other living quarter is missed. The people who occupy that space are missed as a consequence. The second occurs when all the living space is enumerated but not all of the occupants -- either because the enumerators or respondents are confused by the application of residence rules or the definition of a household, or because respondents deliberately withhold information, or because, as we shall see later, they are poorly informed (Pritzker and Rothwell 1968:62).

It seems immediately clear that in the present study we are not dealing with the first type of miscount, in which living quarters as such are overlooked or enumerators are refused access. Our sample does not contain a single case of this kind.

In the instances of missing individuals and misinterpreted household heads, the internal evidence of the interview records provides no indication that the enumerators were confused. Neither the interviewers' visit to our own household nor accounts we have heard from others who were questioned give any indication that either the content and structure of the interview questions or the particular conduct of the enumerators contributed to the cases of underreporting. We have no evidence that the sample included any "close-out cases" of households in which enumerators were unable to make contact with anyone; thus no "close-out procedures" of soliciting information from neighbors or other non-occupants appear to have been used. Intimate knowledge of the households and the community does not suggest that in the cases of underenumeration

the respondents experienced any confusion, lacked the knowledge required, or misunderstood either the meaning of the survey questions or the nature of the information requested. The overwhelming weight of the evidence indicates that the respondents simply chose to omit certain key individuals from their answers.

It is noteworthy that in all but 5 of the 25 households the interview respondent was an adult woman. These are the senior individuals likely to be at home in most dwellings when enumerators arrive, which means among other things that they may easily be misperceived as apparent domicile heads. The 5 cases of male respondents are significant as exceptions to this pattern. One is a man who works at home much of the time (the ethnographer); one is an adolescent whose mother is a working woman; one was a house-bound invalid with a working wife at the time of the interviews; one was a night-shift worker whose mother and wife were day workers; and last is an elderly individual who lives alone. It is also noteworthy that these 5 respondents were the sources of information from most of the households where resident adult males were not ommitted from the survey counts. Among the 20 female respondents only 4 did in their households. not produce understatements of the adult males / Even these exceptions are instructive. Two are domiciles in which there was in fact no male resident of 19 or older; one is a family with foster children required by social service regulations to maintain a two-parent household; the last is an ultra-respectable, highly religious family.

In short, practically all the significant inaccurate information came from adult females who had some reason for neglecting to mention productive men residing in their domiciles. The reasons for this underreporting can be found

in certain conditions of life in Blackston. The basic condition is the material poverty of the area and its population. Very few households can maintain a minimally adequate domestic economy without some combination of the three principal locally available sources of support. These are (1) conventional low-wage employment which is often insecure or temporary, (2) various forms of minimal and legally restrictive public assistance, and (3) numerous types of extra-legal enterprise that are quite variable, unreliable, and often risky. In the portion of our sample for which adequate income data are available, no less than 94% of the households are supported in part by conventionally earned income. At the same time, however, a full 81% of the same sample receive some form of public assistance. Moreover, nearly everyone benefits directly or indirectly from such sources as the stolen-goods market.

No single means of support is adequate by itself. Yet each combination produces inherent contradictions which impose added vulnerabilities accompanying each increment in resources. Any known income from employment beyond the lowest levels reduces the allowable income from welfare or makes a household ineligible for public assistance. Likewise, most forms of welfare payments officially require, in effect, that there be no significant wage earner in the household. All types of extra-legal gain carry a greater or lesser threat of punitive sanctions which directly or indirectly reduce other sources of income, often to zero. Under these conditions, household economies can be maintained only through a judicious but nonetheless precarious balance of the advantages and disadvantages in the available economic resources.

A crucial factor in maintaining this balance is avoiding public exposure and preventing official knowledge of all vulnerable behavior. This is neces-

sary so that contradictions and inconsistencies will not be disclosed and punitive sanctions not invoked. The result is that most people are strongly motivated to withhold information about their personal affairs because they believe that such knowledge might well be used against them by the authorities. This means that within the community there is a universal wariness about personal disclosure and a general tacit agreement that each individual's and each family's affairs are their own business. With respect to outsiders and anyone suspected of directly or indirectly reporting to external agencies, these cautions are doubly enforced.

All this applies with greatest force to information about the presence and family roles of productive adult males. This can be accounted for primarily by the sexual division of labor and peculiarities of welfare regulations. Men are most likely to bring in the conventionally earned income which if disclosed would be grounds for denying public assistance. Men also are more active than women in extra-legal economic efforts, particularly the more risky enterprises. Furthermore, wives and mothers are most likely to be at home during the day and therefore to be the point of contact between the household and outsiders ranging from social workers and bill collectors to census interviewers. Thus the structure of the entire situation is such as to make women visible and prominent in the view of external investigators, just as it obscures the presence and activities of men from the eyes of outsiders.

Further analysis of the data at hand will show how these factors operate in the present cases. In all 15 households where male heads and other adult men were not reported, the domestic unit receives significant support from both employment and welfare. In all 7 households which did report a male head

(#9, 10, 15, 23, 28, 29, 31), this vulnerable combination of incomes either does not exist or is present only in a form that is irrelevant to the danger of disclosure. Five of these households (including the ethnographer's) are not involved with the welfare system, and indeed they are the only units in the sample not receiving some form of public assistance. One family is headed by a man who receives disability payments which are officially unaffected by other sources of income. The remaining unit consists of a solitary male. Otherwise stated, no household in a position to lose significant amounts of income by disclosing the presence of productive males reported these important family members to the census interviewers.

It should not be imagined, of course, that these varied sources of income produce economic surplus or security. All households but one in this sample are poor by any relevant standard. A large family with three unreported men is one of the poorest, in spite of taking full advantage of all available resources. They have just lived through an entire winter without heat or hot water; they are chronically short of clothing and other necessities. The one family that is relatively well off does maintain its comparative comfort largely through the vulnerable means described. Not only did the respondent in this household neglect to report her husband, but she also underreported their income by perhaps 300%. (Although we do not yet feel confident of demonstrating this with fully convincing empirical evidence, we have little doubt that income in general is even more seriously misrecorded than household membership.)

Observation of much relevant behavior, and recording of many pertinent discussions, shows that motives which might be counted upon to induce more accurate reporting are either inoperative or heavily counterbalanced by the factors already

described. Assurances of confidentiality and assertions that the census is unconnected with other official agencies are routinely dismissed as carrying no credibility. Appeals to community or group self-interest, such as the "make black count" campaign, are generally classed with unreliable political promises or regarded as contradicting individual self-interest. Possible penalties for withholding information are either disregarded altogether or treated as a much lesser threat than the dangers of disclosure.

Many of the queries on census forms are too much like the questions asked by policemen, social workers, landlords, creditors, and tax agents not to arouse threatening suspicions. Official recording of household membership, employment status, and income data alone are easily seen as potentially leading to higher rent or eviction, welfare or tax investigation, harassment by an assortment of powerful organizations ranging from credit agencies to the police. It is obvious that once the information is recorded its use is quite beyond the respondent's control. People have had sufficient experience with data collected by one agency turning up in the hands of another so that they find it difficult to believe that census reports will be treated otherwise. Indeed there is a widespread assumption that both governmental and commercial organizations routinely exchange information on individuals who are of mutual interest. By the nature of the situation, no significant positive experience with the census is available to counteract this.

Moreover, strong sentiments and values are expressed in active disapproval of the census and other comparable inquiries. It has already been noted that personal and family affairs are regarded as private business. It is often stated that census takers and other inquiring interviewers are simply not

entitled to such information; that is, they have no right to ask for it. In short, most people object to such interviews not only because they fear their interests will be hurt but also because they do not regard the inquiring enterprise itself as legitimate. All this is further conditioned by a widely shared perception of officialdom and powerful external agencies in general as exploitive and oppressive in their relations with the community. The minimum of trust required for people to be willing to reveal themselves just does not exist in this context.

Cultural values are quite significant in relation to these behavior patterns. Our evidence on this score is more extensive for Afro-Americans than for Hispano-Americans, but we believe that what follows is generally true for both groups. People are fully aware that the behavior which has been described here violates conventional ethics and in many instances is illegal as well. Moreover, they do not often deny the legitimacy of the norms or rules as such. The ethical position commonly expressed is rather that, in these contexts, more important and vital imperatives supersede and prevail over regulations, legalities, or truthfulness. The principle most often invoked is survival. Every person's primary duty is to insure his own and his family's survival and essential welfare. While breaking rules and violating laws are wrongful acts, neglecting this primary obligation is much more immoral.

It is further believed that the infractions involved in survival techniques are relatively innocuous because they do not usually threaten the vital interests of other persons. Personal violence or injury in a physical sense is seldom involved, and appropriation of funds or property is mainly practiced against bureaucracies or proprietors assumed to be able to sustain the loss

without any individual suffering seriously. Beyond this, there is considerable individual and group pride in the abilities and skills displayed through the struggle to survive. Successes in the struggle are celebrated and respected. This is not confined to valuing the stylized and sometimes dramatic circumventions of the law in what has been called "the hustling ethic" (Hudson 1970). It also involves much more domestic virtues, as in the belief that no matter how poor people are they must feed their children well - an injunction which concrete evidence indicates is indeed followed in this community (Valentine and Valentine 1971b).

It is often noted by community members that, compared with their own derelictions, much greater corruption and unjust human injury are commonly experienced from such representatives of the authorities as policemen, welfare workers, judges, and politicians. To survive without wealth or power in such a system is seen as requiring the devices and strategies which have been described. Regardless of how these views might be evaluated by external observers, within the community these are strongly held beliefs which give moral force to the behavior in question. This is an ethical code. As such it does not consist of deviant or special values. Rather it is an adaptation of dominant conventions to special socioeconomic conditions. Accompanying etiquette and patterns of verbal communication may be more distinctive culturally, at least for Afro-Americans. Very briefly, these include a preference for indirection, omission;, and vagueness as opposed to flat refusals to communicate or direct expressions of hostility. Even apart from material considerations of self-interest, the essentials of these several patterns are not likely to be disregarded or violated merely to accomodate the requests of census interviewers.

All 17 cases of missing men and all 15 of the uncounted or mislabeled male household heads are specifically and concretely accountable in terms of these patterns as they apply to the particular situation of each domicile. In every case, vital household resources might well be lost if the presence of productive men were exposed to the authorities. The two instances of unreported adult females are equally understandable in the same terms. Both are young unmarried mothers who make ends meet by living with their parents even though they receive public assistance officially designated to enable them to maintain separate quarters. Nearly all the unreported younger children are the offspring of these two mothers. One remaining youngster was left out of the household roster because, although she lived with her grandparents, her mother received public payments for her separate maintenance. In short, all significant discrepancies appear to be effectively explained by the interpretation which has been presented.

3. Interpretations and Implications

In some respects, the results of our methodological comparison are consistent with interpretations based on extensive evaluations of the census by other approaches (Heer 1968, Trans-action 1968). Our findings support the view that the most serious inaccuracies of underenumeration are to be found in statistics on poverty-stricken minority groups in large cities. Our analysis is also consonant with the finding of others that within these populations the most frequently undercounted category is adult men. The evidence reported here is likewise compatible with the interpretation that many nonwhites are missed because, although their dwelling places are counted as units, the inhabitants of the living quarters are only incompletely reported as individuals (Pritzker and Rothwell 1968:62-68). Not only the facts as to who was missed in the Blackston surveys, but also the reasons why they were missed, agree with these general propositions about census coverage.

On the other hand, the comparison reported here produced a considerably greater margin of error than is usually found in analyses and interpretations of underenumeration. The part of our comparison summarized in Table 3 may be of some significance in this connection. It is interesting to note that these three over-reported households are not only the sole instances of over-counting but also the only cases in which misunderstanding appears to have played a significant part. In past discussions of survey inaccuracies (e.g. Pritzker and Rothwell 1968), conceptual confusions and failures in communication have usually been suggested as probable causes of underenumeration. What minor evidence of misunderstanding we have in the present study seems rather to point in the opposite direction, toward overenumeration as the typical outcome when communication fails between interviewer and respondent. The extra

individuals erroneously placed in the domestic units just mentioned might well have been counted twice in a complete census. Thus it seems worth considering that errors arising from misunderstandings may tend to mask the full extent of actual underenumeration when the undercount is calculated by statistical means from documentary evidence (birth, death, and migration registration) or by theoretical means (comparing expected sex ratios with reported sex ratios). This consideration may help in some measure to explain the rather wide divergence between the magnitude of error suggested by this study and the levels of underenumeration arrived at by the more usual methods.

Another inconsistency between our evidence and that considered in other studies may also be relevant to the question how extensive census underenumeration really is. The present report does not support the interpretation that the men most commonly unreported are young and that they often belong to floating or transient populations (Siegal 1968, Pritzker and Rothwell 1968). Only two of our missing men are under 30, a majority of them are over 40, and they range up to 59 years of age. Moreover, all of them are reasonably settled household members and residents. The usual estimates of underenumeration appear to suggest that few men with these characteristics are missed by the census. Furthermore, such discussions seem to imply that when settled individuals are missed it is most often because their whole dwelling units, including other household members, go unreported. Since our comparison sample includes no transient individuals and no wholly unrecorded dwelling units, the entire Blackston undercount is inconsistent with these commonly invoked explanations. Yet the undercount remains substantial in size. This again leads us to wonder whether prevailing methods of calculating and correcting survey inaccuracies

may fail to detect or rectify a significant amount of actual underenumeration.

Allowing for the fact that this is one restricted study based on a small sample, we nevertheless feel that some fairly drastic implications are strongly indicated for further exploration. First, we would suggest that the magnitude of error in the census and other interview or questionnaire surveys is probably much greater than has been recognized, at least for low-income urban minority populations. Second, the reasons for underenumeration are often different from those that are commonly recognized. Thirdly, the major causes of the problem lie in the material and socioeconomic conditions in which these populations live and their cultural adaptations to these conditions. A fourth implication is consistent with the others and can be considered next. That is, it seems quite unlikely that the causes of error will be significantly affected or successfully dealt with by the various modifications in, and checks on, census procedures which have been instituted in the past or proposed more recently.

The usual procedures of post-enumeration surveys are not likely to be helpful because they are not relevant to the major sources of understatement. Finding the "best respondent," asking "probing questions," or arranging longer visits by better trained interviewers would probably have little effect on respondents' behavior. The proposal for "simultaneous administration of two censuses or samples in the same area" (Lee 1968:98) will not solve the problems identified here. Respondents can be expected to react consistently no matter how many times they are interviewed. For the same reason, post-enumeration surveys may discover dwelling units that were previously neglected, but they cannot be expected to deal effectively with a respondent population that is

consistent and united in its unwillingness to make certain disclosures. Employing neighborhood people as enumerators will not make a significant difference, for it is not the ethnicity or community affiliation of the interviewer which conditions the motives we have described, but rather the respondent's perception as to who may receive the information. Paying enumerators a bonus for each name recorded may motivate interviewers to produce large (but not necessarily accurate) counts, but it will not affect the attitudes of respondents. Giving forms to school children to be filled out by their parents is equally irrelevant to the main sources of difficulty. Among the various checking procedures we have seen suggested, matching welfare roles against census results is perhaps the most naive of all.

The use of comprehensive address registers and postal personnel to find people also seems beside the point. Certainly the practice of sending out questionnaires to be completed and returned by mail is no solution. While we do not know the precise rate of return for the mailed forms of the 1970 census in our community, it must have been low. During that week, the most conspicuous items in neighborhood garbage cans were those yellow forms. (Press reports' quoting regional census officials cited mail returns of 42-48% in the major slums of this metropolitan area, compared with 85-87% in nearby suburbs.) In any case, even a high rate of return would leave quite open the whole question of the validity of the information reported.

Equally irrelevant to the principal sources of the problem are publicity and informational programs, We have already noted the dominant reaction in Blackston to the "make black count" campaign. A similar device recently reported is the slogan, "You are important. Don't be a missing person" (Trans-

action 1968:56). This again clearly misses the point which seems central to our findings: many people have strong reasons to want to be "missing persons" as far as the authorities are concerned. Hiring local personnel to give out information or answer inquiries can hardly be expected to alter or penetrate the patterns of resistance which have been described. An experiment carried out by the female member of our research team illustrates this point. She called the local information service of the Census Bureau at the time when the 1970 mail forms were in circulation. She stated that she was on welfare and asked whether she could safely report her husband. After some discussion, the information clerk explained that the Census Bureau maintains a policy of confidentiality but her personal advice was not to record the man of the house. A press statement at about this time attributed to the regional census director, referring to "ghetto or poverty areas," and explaining that "there is a communication gap between those areas and all types of government" struck us as a masterpiece of simplification and understatement.

These devices all are ineffective because they do not deal with the basic problem of the relationship between those who are seeking the information and those asked to provide it. We have seen that this relationship is conditioned by fundamental socioeconomic realities and cultural adaptations. Our central conclusion is that these problems cannot be fully solved by any technique based on mass interviews or questionnaires. Merely to demonstrate the pattern and extent of the difficulty in part of one community, has required lengthy and intensive application of data gathering approaches at the opposite extreme from such surveys. The census and other comparable surveys are instruments which are inherently incapable of resolving these difficulties. No doubt the bureau-

cratic efficiency and technical proficiency of the various agencies which produce mass social statistics can be improved. It should be recognized and accepted, however, that censuses and the like are methodologically unsuited for dealing successfully with the kinds of problems identified here.

During the furor which developed around the 1970 census, some of the relevant issues emerged with a certain degree of clarity in public debate. For example, a single news story from Washington cited all the following statements (New York Times, 6 September 1970). A California congressman is quoted as saying, "This may not be a problem that the Census Bureau could solve. Some people simply may not want to be counted." An aid to a big city mayor advocated "some kind of permanent mechanism, some kind of full-time staff of people who could develop the confidence of communities where census takers now tend to be mistrusted as government agents." The national director of the census is reported to have replied, "I'm not sure we could develop all that much confidence in some areas where even the mailmen need police help."

Even though interviewers may often feel insecure in low-income minority areas, and the news media have been full of reports that this helps account for high turnover in enumerators, our own experience does not indicate that physical safety is in fact a significant problem. The real issue of confidence is not any kind of danger to interviewers but the perceived and suspected dangers to respondents. For this very reason, moreover, the problem cannot be solved by any "permanent mechanism" which is bureaucratically and politically controlled from outside the community. Such an agency would undoubtedly be mistrusted just as much as itinerant enumerators.

The broader implications of all this extend well beyond the realm of methodology as such. The major consequences for human beings flow from the content, meaning, and use of survey results. It is often suggested that a census corrected for undercounts among the poor and minorities could benefit these groups in terms of political representation and allocation of government funds. Much more fundamental than this, however, is the fact that censuses and other surveys contribute to the perceptions and images of society and its consittuent groups which underlie so much of conventional popular wisdom, existing social science theory, and established public policy. The quality of the information produced may therefore be quite crucial to the whole relationship between a group like Afro-Americans and the surrounding society.

The most obvious case in point is the image of the female-headed household, so widely assumed to typify the poor in general and Afro-Americans in particular, and so generally associated with an unstable, pathological family life said to play a major role in perpetuating poverty. Generalizations about this whole topic are invariably supported by reference to the very census statistics which we have shown here to be of such doubtful validity in our community. This same basic source is cited whether the purpose is to profile the alleged psycho-social disorganization of Afro-Americans (Pettigrew 1964:15-24; Parsons and Clark 1966; Proshansky and Newton 1968:204f; Rainwater 1966:169, 1970: 115-117, 164-166), to establish the supposedly pathological self-perpetuation of poverty in general (Hurley 1969:76ff, Kosa et al 1969:19-25), or to support the specific thesis that "The fundamental problem [responsible for Afro-American inequality] is that of family structure" (Moynihan 1965:1). Even social scientists who do not accept the notion of a self-perpetuating "culture

of poverty" nevertheless cite the same statistics and base their own interview surveys on the assumption that "a woman is husbandless if she says she is not married" (Kriesberg 1970:17-18, 61, 183). The same fatal figures appear still again even in works by scholars who deny that Black family life is either degraded or responsible for Afro-American disadvantage and who seek through other evidence to establish a more positive understanding of the relevant domestic institutions (Billingsley 1968:14ff, 198ff; Murray 1970:22-38).

We even find the ironical situation of a well known specialist in Black Studies who uses this same type of statistics in an effort "to debunk some of the myths of the Great White Society" (Hare 1969:109). Part of his argument runs:

> So, certainly we have to begin to question some of these things. We have to question the monogamous system, I think. The Census Bureau tells me that for every 100 males in New York, nonwhite males in New York, there are 33 extra females. This insures that somebody has got to engage in extracurricular activity, or else some women will be suffering a shortage of the normal processes of life. And this is going to make for family breakdown. . . Then they're going to send in Moynihan and these other fellows up at Yale and Harvard to study the black family and to show how disorganized it is and how if we'd just get our family more stabilized, we could do pretty well (Ibid. 110).

Thus in the very process of debunking related ideas, this author appears to have accepted the statistical myth of the missing men.

Another writer with a similar viewpoint has described the state of affairs with respect to Afro-American social statistics much more accurately as we see it. In the following passage he is suggesting that there are several factors to be considered in responding to the popular view that Afro-Americans are a small and weak minority.

> One /such factor/ is the census - which to secular America is like the Bible - it's something you have to believe in because it's the only thing like it, every ten years and there it is, it's got all the data in it. Black people have said a lot of different figures because we knew the census wasn't true, but we didn't know what was true, so we just said what we wanted to say. The census finally agreed with us and admitted that they were wrong. We all have to accept the fact that we don't know how many black people there are in this country, nor do we know what kind of black people they are, nor do we know where they are. I suspect it's much like Nigeria where the black people used to go into the bush and hide when the agents of the colonial regime would come around and count heads; then when the first Nigerian census came out, they were convinced that maybe census was a good thing. In any case, the whole point about the census being a basis of truth needs to be seriously questioned, if for no other reason than the white people who run it said it was messed up (McWorter 1969:66). **

The images supported by the generally accepted statistics enable the wider public of relatavely privileged strata to stigmatize the poor and minorities as deserving their fate and bringing it upon themselves. These are popular perceptions which support the broad political effort to reduce the assistance presently available and to circumscribe the freedoms now open to the poor through various "reforms" of the welfare system. In particular, these images and the accompanying survey findings have been used systematically and intensively to lobby and propagandize for a so-called "family assistance plan" which would guarantee less assistance than presently exists for the poor families of all but a few of the poorest and least generous states. All this is part of a widespread and pernicious ideological process which has recently been cogently identified as "blaming the victim" (Ryan 1971).

Yet our findings show that the supposedly ubiquitous female-headed household is far from omnipresent in Blackston. If these findings should

be even moderately well confirmed in other poor Black communities, this whole structure of aggressive interpretation and defensive reinterpretation would come tumbling down. The scholarly and scientific images of matriarchs rampant and matrifolk raging would appear absurd. So would that supremely paradoxical epic figure, the emasculated Black who somehow manages to be utterly dominated by women and yet to procreate with wild abandon and take no responsibility for the issue. Even without confirmation from other communities the onus falls upon proponents of "poverty culture" to explain this striking exception to their easy generalizations about unconventional family structures as "poverty-producing factors." Statements like the following simply will not stand against the Blackston evidence.

> As for family structure, the nuclear family, with a planned number of children, is the ideal acquisitive unit . . . Any deviation from this ideal model is likely to increase the risk of poverty. . . Broken families with their poverty-producing environment appear to be common in groups disadvantaged by race and low education. . . The poor family seems to have a pattern of socialization in which the skills of acquisitiveness do not have a steady place and cannot be easily transmitted to the children. . . An unwillingness to defer gratifications seems to be a common characteristic not only of the budgeting and spending habits but also of the sex behavior of the poor class (Kosa 1969:19-23).

The Blackston findings are much more consistent with the thrust of these interpretive conclusions:

> And yet we live in a society which is highly oriented to social change. The Negro family must have a central place in this process of social evolution. In this respect, our own view is consistent with that expressed by Daniel P. Moynihan in his several writings and public appearances. But unlike Moynihan and others, we do not view the Negro family as a causal nexus in a 'tange of pathology' which feeds on itself. Rather, we view the Negro family in theoretical perspective as a subsystem of the larger society. It is, in our view an absorbing,adaptive, and amazingly resilient mechanism for the socialization of its children and the civilization of its society (Billingsley 1968:33).

The foregoing considerations taken together persuade us that it is time for the practitioners and beneficiaries of interviews, questionnaires, and surveys to face up to their most stringent critics. This moves us to close the present section with a somewhat extensive excerpt which constitutes a healthy dose of such criticism. The quotation is offered as an introduction to the proposal in the following section,which we believe might rather readily produce a solid basis for judging whether this critique is wholly valid, entirely unjustified, or somewhere in between.

> The statistics and profiles of most contemporary social science surveys also serve to confirm the negative impressions about Negroes that the great mass of 'uninvolved' white people have formed from folklore and the mass media.
>
> What such universal concurrence actually reflects, however, is far less indicative of the alleged objectivity, comprehensiveness,validity, and reliability of the methodology employed than of its preoccupation with the documentation of black shortcomings.
>
> . . .
>
> The situation now is that the contemporary folklore of racism in the United States is derived from social science surveys in which white norms and black deviations are tantamoun to white well being and black pathology.
>
> That most social science technicians may be entirely unaware of the major role they play in the propagation of such folklore can be readily conceded. But the fact that they remain oblivious to the application of the material that they assemble neither reduce the degree of their involvement nor mitigates the distortion, simplification, and confusion that they aid and abet. As a matter of fact, their innoce, which is not altogether unlike that of certain ever so nonviolent munitions experts, allows them to function with a routine detachment that is even more deadly than deliberate underhanded manipulation of facts, figures, and interpretations. . . The unwitting survey technician has no such problems. Believing himself to be free of ulterior motives, he assumes that his studies are disinterested.

As even the most casual examination of his actual point of departure and his customary procedures will reveal, however, such a technician's innocence is not nearly so innocent as it is intellectually irresponsible. Nor should his lack of concern with consequences be mistaken for scientific objectivity. When the technician undertakes any research project without having become thoroughly familiar with its practical context and with the implications of his underlying thesis, his action does not represent the spirit of scientific inquiry at all. It is the very embodiment of traditional piety. And it permits him to substantiate the insidious speculations and malevolent preconceptions of the white status quo as readily as it allows him to do anything else (Murray 1970:26-27, 31-32).

** Events reported in the news media as this discussion is being composed clearly suggest that the general kind of problems highlighted here are hardly confined either to Black-White conflicts or to the American scene. News from the United Kingdom indicates not only that "West Indians, Africans, Pakistanis, and Indians" fear that the government "might use census information to facilitate deportation," but also that Irish republicans, Welsh nationalists, and even English Young Liberals publicly burned large numbers of official forms during Census Week, 1971 because "they feared the information might be used against them" (New York Times, 27 April 1971).

4. A Proposed Solution

Our research experience in Blackston convinces us that the foregoing critique cannot be dismissed or disregarded. The questions raised are quite relevant to the problems identified earlier in this report, and good answers to these questions are not presently available. Yet we do not believe that the problem is impossible of solution. Indeed it seems to us that the study reported here itself indicates the type of remedial measures that are needed. The Blackston research shows that ethnography can help greatly to identify the magnitude and direction of survey errors in one kind of area and population where underenumeration and other difficulties are known to be serious. We know of no reason why the same approach cannot produce comparable results elsewhere.

Optimum completeness of information can be achieved only through intensive, long-term resident participation in the life of the community by independent researchers. This ethnographic approach is the only means by which researchers can come to be regarded as trustworthy, for it is the only way to give people convincing experience that they will not be compromised or injured by revealing themselves. This method also maximizes opportunities for direct observation of actual behavior which is inevitably more revealing than any system of verbal requests for information. Much that is easily omitted from responses to any interview or questionnaire is semi-public knowledge to observant neighbors. Even the most cautious devices for self-protection are often largely inoperative against intimate acquaintance and systematic observation. It is within the ethical code of the community described earlier to accept tacitly the fact that a great deal of such direct knowledge may be accumulated through experience by persons who are known to live under the same conditions as those whom they study. Participant ethnography itself

remains imperfect and cannot be expected to yield absolutely full and accurate information, even on the small scale to which it is unavoidably confined. Nevertheless, the comparisons cited earlier strongly suggest that this approach is markedly more successful than other common techniques.

The major advantage of surveys is the large number of people they can reach. For obvious practical reasons, ethnography cannot match this coverage in quantitative terms. Participant observation therefore cannot be a substitute for mass interviews or questionnaires. What is needed is rather a combination of the two approaches which will capitalize on the strengths of both in order to reduce the weaknesses of each.

To this end we propose that the research design of survey programs should regularly include independent ethnographic checks or controls. This proposal can also be viewed the other way around, suggesting that ethnographic research should regularly be made more useful by matching some of its data gathering against relevant surveys. Considerations of cost, availability of personnel, and other matters of feasibility clearly will require that the proposed controls be highly selective in relation to the massive coverage of survey work. This would presumably mean that ethnographic control studies should be strategically placed to cover samples of populations already known or suspected to pose serious methodological problems which are beyond the capacity of survey techniques alone to solve. In this respect there is the fortunate circumstance that ethnographers, anthropologists of complex societies, and other similarly inclined scholars tend to be interested in urban and rural minorities and the poor.

It is beyond the scope of this report to suggest in detail the scale of

such efforts that might be possible. For the sake of discussion, however, it might be reasonable to establish that no basic national survey, such as a census, should be planned without conjoining ethnographic research on at least one urban and one rural community of Afro-Americans, of Hispano-Americans, of Native Americans, and of poor Whites in two or more geographic regions for each group. This would suggest a tentative initial program of sixteen or more ethnographies to accompany any basic nationwide demographic survey. Starting now, it should be quite within the realm of possibility to organize such a minimal program for a census in 1975 or earlier. Extensions of the essential idea would not be difficult to devise. Before long it should be possible to express many social statistics in terms of survey results accompanied by adjustments, extrapolated from ethnographic samples for many ethnic, socio-economic, and regional segments of the national population.

The organization and operations of such an effort could begin by envisioning extensions and adaptations of the project described here. A double-blind independence between ethnographers and enumerators would be a methodological essential. The ethnographies would have to be long-term intensive, resident participatory efforts guided by the purposes of community studies and testing sociocultural hypotheses, by no means confined to gathering demographic data for matching against the census. Some anthropologists and others already carrying out or planning relevant research should be available and amenable to arrangements for cooperation along the lines suggested. Additional personnel might be commissioned and, where necessary, trained for this work. This could also be a means to increase opportunities for members of minority groups to become social scientists and contribute to the understanding of their own and

other communities.

In any such program it would be of utmost importance to dissociate the ethnographic work from either actual or suspected reporting of individual data to authorities or organizations which might use the information in any way against the people concerned. Ethnographers must be fully convinced that they actually control their data in this respect, and they must be prepared to demonstrate this if individuals or groups within the communities under study should ask. The sense of being under official and non-official surveillance is too well developed and too strongly resented in many relevant populations to be dealt with effectively by pro-forma declarations of dedication to confidentiality. Perhaps some special system for sharing data with surveyors without divulging individual identities would have to be devised. While experience in Blackston has convinced us that communities with much hostility toward outsiders are nevertheless open to genuinely participant inquiry, we are equally convinced that the time is past when any such inquiries could proceed without being accountable to the people under study.

Some ethnographers and other scientists will be convinced, as we are, that this accountability extends beyond concern for individual confidentiality to responsibility for broader social and political effects flowing from their work. This means, first of all, that any publication of or access to information such as that reported here from Blackston must be arranged so as to protect the interests of the community, as defined from a community viewpoint. For example, efforts must be made to prevent published reports on deviant behavior from leading to special crackdowns by agencies of social control or discriminatory punitive legislation from various levels of government. Thus

at a time like the present when major political efforts are being made to reduce public assistance benefits by stigmatizing welfare recipients, any conscientious ethnographer of the poor must be troubled by the possibility that his work may be used in support of these inhumane political initiatives.

Yet this whole problem area is full of ambiguities, dilemmas, and indeterminate complications. It is difficult at best for researchers to maintain anything approaching reliable control over the use of material once it has been published or otherwise shared. Particularly when dealing with vulnerable groups whose trust in the ethnographer makes the work possible, abstractions about the scientific value or professional obligation of publication are insufficient to resolve these dilemmas. It may often be necessary to make difficult and uncertain judgements as to the balance of positive and negative consequences likely to flow from various decisions in this realm. If any such program as that sketched above should be instituted, it would be vitally important that participating ethnographers have maximum freedom of judgement in these matters, as well as full responsibility for their own data. Many decisions in this area will no doubt be heavily conditioned by one's evaluation as to the benevolence or otherwise of both public authorities and private powers toward the peoples and communities most concerned. It must be noted that participatory experience in ghetto communities is not conducive to sanguine expectations in this regard.

On the other hand, it also seems plausible to posit substantial positive consequences - quite beyond scientific benefits - if the quality of our basic social statistics can be significantly improved. A successful program along these lines could greatly increase the accuracy of the basic perceptions and

images of society and its component communities referred to earlier. Nothing could be of more fundamental significance than the possibility of correcting systematic errors in generally accepted statistics which discriminate against minorities and the poor in the deepest sense of distorting and falsifying their nature as human groups. To the extent that these distortions perpetuate stigmatizing stereotypes, they help to rationalize the discriminatory oppressions of inequality and to justify an unjust status quo. To the extent that the program sketched in outline here might validly counteract these justifications and rationalizations, it would be worth considerable risk.

Table 1. Summary Comparison of Data from Ethnographic Observation and Census Interviews

	Ethnography		Census		Undercount	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Population						
Age 0 through 18						
Male	48	32	45	35	3	6
Female	47	31	43	34	4	9
Age 19 and above						
Male	28	18	11	9	17	61
Female	30	19	28	22	2	7
Total	153	100	127	100	26	17
Households						
Male head	22	88	7	28	15	68
Female head	3	12	18	72	--	--
Total	25	100	25	100	--	--

Table 2. Relationships, Characteristics, and Census Coverage of Household Members Observed by Ethnographers

Household	Individual Relationship	Sex	Age	Ethnic Status	Coverage by Census
1	Hd	M	Ad	HA	NR
	Wi	F	27	HA	R
	So	M	6	HA	R
	Da	F	3	HA	R
	Da	F	2	HA	R
	Da	F	1	HA	R
2	Hd	M	40	HA	NR
	Wi	F	39	HA	R
	So	M	11	HA	R
	So	M	8	HA	R
	Da	F	7	HA	R
	Da	F	6	HA	R
3	Hd	M	25	HA	NR
	Wi	F	24	HA	R
	So	M	7	HA	R
	So	M	6	HA	R
4 (Vacant)					
5	Hd	M	42	AA	NR
	Wi	F	39	AA	R
	So	M	6	AA	R
6 (Absent)					
7 (Vacant)					
8 (Vacant)					
9	Hd	M	40	EA	R
	Wi	F	31	AA	R
	So	M	2	AA	R
10	Hd	M	34	AA	R
	Wi	F	33	AA	R
	So	M	15	AA	R
	Da	F	14	AA	R
	Da	F	12	AA	R
	So	M	5	AA	R

Household	Individual Relationship	Sex	Age	Ethnic Status	Coverage by Census
11	Hd	M	32	AA	NR
	Wi	F	29	AA	R
	WiDa	F	7	AA	R
	WiDa	F	5	AA	R
12	Hd	M	36	AA	NR
	Wi	F	31	AA	R
	So	M	10	AA	R
	So	M	9	AA	R
	So	M	7	AA	R
13	Hd	M	41	AA	NR
	Wi	F	24	AA	R
	WiSo	M	9	AA	R
	WiDa	F	8	AA	R
	WiSo	M	6	AA	R
	WiDa	F	4	AA	R
	Da	F	1	AA	R
14	Hd	M	Ad	AA	NR
	Wi	F	35	AA	R
	WiDa	F	18	AA	R
	Da	F	16	AA	R
	So	M	15	AA	R
	Da	F	13	AA	R
	So	M	12	AA	R
15	Hd	M	36	AA	R
	Wi	F	34	AA	R
	So	M	15	AA	R
	Da	F	14	AA	R
	So	M	12	AA	R
	FoDa	F	3	AA	R
	FoSo	M	2	AA	R
16	Hd	M	47	AA	MR
	Wi	F	45	AA	R
	So	M	26	AA	NR
	So	M	18	AA	R
17	Hd	F	42	AA	R
	Da	F	17	AA	R
	So	M	16	AA	R
	So	M	14	AA	R
	So	M	13	AA	R
	So	M	11	AA	R

18 (Vacant)

Household	Individual Relationship	Sex	Age	Ethnic Status	Coverage by Census
19	Hd	M	Ad	HA	NR
	Wi	F	35	HA	R
	So	M	14	HA	R
	So	M	13	HA	R
	Da	F	12	HA	R
	Da	F	11	HA	R
	So	M	9	HA	R
	So	M	7	HA	R
20	Hd	M	45	AA	NR
	Wi	F	39	AA	R
	WiBr	M	42	AA	NR
	WiDa	F	22	AA	NR
	WiSo	M	20	AA	NR
	WiDa	F	18	AA	R
	WiDa	F	16	AA	R
	WiSo	M	14	AA	R
	WiDa	F	10	AA	R
	WiDa	F	9	AA	R
	WiDaSo	M	2	AA	R
	WiDaDa	F	1	AA	R
	WiDaDa	F	5	AA	NR
	WiDaDa	F	5	AA	NR
	WiDaDa	F	4	AA	NR
21	Hd	F	23	AA	R
	Br	M	18	AA	NR
	Br	M	15	AA	NR
	Da	F	5	AA	R
	So	M	3	AA	R
	So	M	NB	AA	R
22	Hd	F	43	AA	R
	Da	F	20	AA	R
	Da	F	19	AA	R
	So	M	17	AA	R
	So	M	13	AA	R
	Da	F	11	AA	R
	DaDa	F	4	AA	R
	DaSo	M	2	AA	R
	DaSo	M	1	AA	R
23	Hd	M	54	HA	R
	Wi	F	45	HA	R
	WiSo	M	22	AA	R
	WiSo	M	17	AA	R
	WiSo	M	14	AA	R
	Da	F	11	AA	R

Household	Individual Relationship	Sex	Age	Ethnic Status	Coverage by Census
24 (Demolished)					
25	Hd	M	35	HA	NR
	Wi	F	33	HA	R
	WiDa	F	15	HA	R
	WiSo	M	14	HA	R
	WiSo	M	12	HA	R
	WiDa	F	9	HA	R
	WiDa	F	8	HA	R
	WiDa	F	7	HA	R
26	Hd	M	Ad	AA	MR
	Wi	F	36	AA	R
	WiSi	F	33	AA	R
	WiSiSo	M	17	AA	R
	Fr	M	Ad	AA	NR
27	Hd	M	59	AA	NR
	Wi	F	53	AA	R
	Da	F	19	AA	NR
	WiDa	F	16	AA	R
	DaSo	M	7	AA	NR
28	Hd	M	53	AA	R
29	Hd	M	47	AA	R
	Wi	F	50	AA	R
	So	M	17	AA	R
	Da	F	15	AA	R
	Da	F	12	AA	R
	Da	F	7	AA	R
	DaDa	F	3	AA	NR
30 (Vacant)					
31	Hd	M	52	AA	R
	Wi	F	50	AA	R
	So	M	30	AA	R
	SoWi	F	20	AA	R
	SoSo	M	3	AA	R
	SoDa	F	1	AA	R
32	Hd	M	40	HA	NR
	Wi	F	35	HA	R
	So	M	14	HA	R
	Da	F	13	HA	R
	Da	F	10	HA	R
	Da	F	7	HA	R
	Da	F	6	HA	R
	Da	F	5	HA	R
	So	M	4	HA	R
33 (Not a household)					

Table 3. Persons Recorded in Census Interviews but Not Observed as Household Members

Household	Relationship to Head	Age
17	Da	20
	DaDa	3
	DaDa	1
	DaSo	NB
19	Da	16
32	So	20
	So	17
	So	13

Abbreviations

Relationship

- Hd head of household
- Wi wife
- Br brother
- So son
- Da daughter
- WiSo wife's son
- DaDa daughter's daughter
- DaDaDa daughter's daughter's daughter
- FoSo foster son
- Fr friend

Age

- Ad adult
- NB newborn infant

Ethnic status

- AA Afro-American
- EA Euro-American
- HA Hispano-American

Coverage

- R recorded
- NR not recorded
- MR misrecorded

References Cited

Berreman, Gerald, et al.

1971 Anthropology Today. Del Mar, California, CRM Books.

Billingsley, Andrew

1968 Black Families in White America. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.

Caplovitz, David

1963 The Poor Pay More: Consumer Practices of Low-Income Families. New York, Macmillan.

Deutsch, Martin, et al., eds.

1968 Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development. New York, Holt.

Hare, Nathan

1969 A radical perspective on social science curricula. In Robinson et al. 1969.

Harwood, Alan

1970 Participant observation and census data in urban research. Paper prepared for Annual Meeting, American Anthropological Association. Ms.

Heer, David M., ed.

1968 Social Statistics and the City: Report of a Conference. Cambridge, Harvard.

Hudson, Julius R.

1970 The hustling ethic. To appear in Kochman n.d.

Hurley, Rodger L.

1969 Poverty and Mental Retardation: a Causal Relationship. New York, Random House.

Kochman, Thomas, ed.

n.d. Language and Expressive Role Behavior in the Black Inner City. In preparation.

Kosa, John

1969 The nature of poverty. In Kosa et al 1969.

Kosa, John, et al., eds.

1969 Poverty and Health: a Sociological Analysis. Cambridge, Harvard

Kriesberg, Louis

1970 Mothers in Poverty: a Study of Fatherless Families. Chicago, Aldine.

Lee, Everett S.

1968 Needed improvements in census data collection procedures with special reference to the disadvantaged. In Heer 1968.

McWorter, Gerald A.

1969 Deck the ivy racist halls: the case of Black studies. In Robinson et al. 1969.

Moynihan, Daniel P.

1965 The Case for National Action: the Negro Family. Office of Planning and Research, U.S. Department of Labor. Washington.

1966 Employment, income, and the ordeal of the Negro family. In Parsons and Clark 1966.

Murray, Albert

1970 The Omni-Americans: New Perspectives on Black Experience and American Culture. New York, Dutton.

Parsons, Talcott, and Kenneth Clark, eds.

1966 The Negro American. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.

1964 A Profile of the Negro American. Princeton, Van Nostrand.

Pritzker, Leon, and N.D. Rothwell

1968 Procedural difficulties in taking past censuses in predominantly Negro, Puerto Rican, and Mexican areas. In Heer 1968.

Proshansky, Harold, and Peggy Newton

1968 The nature and meaning of Negro self-identity. In Deutsch et al. 1968

Rainwater, Lee

1966 Crucible of identity: the Negro lower-class family. In Parsons and Clark 1966.

1970 Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum. Chicago, Aldine.

Robinson, Armstead L., et al., eds.

1969 Black Studies in the University: a Symposium. New Haven, Yale.

Ryan, William

1971 Blaming the Victim. New York, Random House.

Siegel, Jacob S.

1968 Completeness of coverage of the nonwhite population in the 1960 census and current estimates, and some implications. In Heer 1968.

Trans-action

1968 The census - what's wrong with it, and what can be done about it: a staff report. Trans-action 5:6:49-56.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1966 Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 19. Characteristics of Families Residing in Poverty Areas. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

1967a Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 168. Negro Population: March 1966. Washington, Government Printing Office.

1967b Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 332. Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States. Washington.

1968 Statistical Abstract of the United States: National Data Book and Guide to Sources, 89th ed. Washington.

1970 Census Taker's Dictionary: Decennial Census 1970. Washington.

Valentine, Charles A., and Betty Lou Valentine

1970a Making the scene, digging the action, and telling it like it is. In Whitten and Szwed 1970.

1970b Blackston: progress report on a community study in urban Afro-America. Mimeo.

1970c Preliminary report on a comparative methodological study of underenumeration and related problems. Ms.

1971a What the anthropologist does: case study: in a complex society. In Berreman, et al. 1971.

1971b Observations on diet and nutrition among low-income urban Afro-American infants and children. Paper prepared for National Workshop on Child Feeding Practices. Mimeo.

Whitten, Norman E., and John Szwed, eds.

1970 Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives. New York, Free Press.