RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
(Survey Methodology #2010-17)

The Language of Residence: Respondent Understandings and Census Rules

Eleanor R. Gerber

Statistical Research Division
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, D.C. 20233

Report originally published in 1994.

Report made available online: June 28, 2010

The Language of Residence: Respondent Understandings and Census Rules

Executive Summary

Respondents' understandings of the language and concepts used in the Census and surveys can influence the creation of rosters by encouraging or discouraging the inclusion of certain individuals. They may be unfamiliar with the terms used in the questions or define them differently than intended. They may have a different set of assumptions than the Census Bureau about who should be listed as living with them.

The Cognitive Study of Living Situations was a small scale study of terms and concepts respondents use in understanding residence. The interviews were structured around a series of specially prepared vignettes based on ethnographic sources. The thirty-six respondents who were interviewed included low-income African Americans and Hispanics (groups known to be at risk of undercounting in the Census,) and middle income Whites (the group which most closely resembles the writers of census questions.) Hispanic respondents were interviewed both in Spanish and in English. Findings include:

Although differences few differences between the three groups of respondents emerged, all appear to make different assumptions about residence than Census residence rules assume. Among these assumptions are the following:

1. **Social affiliations are more salient in respondents' judgments than a person's actual presence in a place.** In judging residence, respondents are primarily concerned with stable or long term social attachments, involving kinship, ownership, and cooperation.

2. **The belief that residence has a legal aspect is rather common, and some respondents assume that it is what our questions are asking them about.** Probably no other belief has a greater effect on the rosters that respondents provide, since it radically alters their basic understanding of our questions. It biases rosters in the direction of listing the most stable residence over long periods of time, and of excluding persons whose association with the place do not have this quasi-legal status.

3. **In calculating the residence of children, respondents are mainly interested in who has primary responsibility for the child.** As a result, actual location is even less important a factor in the residence of children than it is in the residence of adults.

4. **College students are likely to be listed at parents' homes because they seen as still-dependent children, and as persons with "legal residence" at the parents' place.** It may prove easier to change the census rule than to change parents' ingrained responses.

5. **Residences which people have "only for work" are not considered primary residences.** People who are "away during the week working" are

counted by respondents along with the residence group to which they "belong" in social or in kin terms.

6. **A considerable grey area exists in the classification of persons as "homeless."** People who are highly mobile may not be seen as "homeless" if they are understood to belong to socially defined "homes". An individual's social role or life-style may lead respondents to conclude, in the absence of complete social information, that certain persons "must have" residences of their own somewhere. These beliefs may mean that certain persons with no stable place of residence will not be included in census rosters as persons "who have no other home".

The rules provided to respondents are, in many respects, experienced as counter-intuitive. This suggests that respondents will continue to misunderstand our intentions even if better means are found of communicating census rules. Perhaps it is time to reevaluate the purposes and logic of the residence rules, to find ways of bringing them closer to the natural tendencies of our respondents.

The Cognitive Study of Living Situations also examined respondent's use of the terms included in questions in the census and in surveys. Findings included the following:

7. **"Live" and "stay" by themselves cannot be counted on to create the conceptual distinction between permanent and temporary residence which census questions need to convey.** The terms vary considerably in meaning in different contexts, and are frequently modified with adjectives and other phrases. Since respondents do use the terms "permanent" and "temporary" as modifiers for residence terms, the inclusion of these modifiers in census questions can reinforce the meanings of "live" and "stay."

8. **The term "usual residence" is never used naturally. When it is introduced, respondents are frequently confused.** The term does not result in a calculation of where an individual "lives and sleeps most of the time." Rather, respondents mentally replace the term with terms that are more familiar to them, particularly "permanent residence." Others may assume that we are looking for some place <u>other than</u> a "permanent residence"; that is, a place where a person is <u>not</u> stably attached. The resulting misconceptions make the term "usual" residence inappropriate for inclusion in census questionnaires. It should be regarded as an in-house bureaucratic category which is neither useful nor appropriate to communicate to respondents.

9. **Respondents' use of the term "household" is somewhat different from census-based meanings of the term.** For our respondents, "households" are natural social units, defined by ties of kinship and cooperation. As a result, unrelated persons may be excluded from household, and kin living elsewhere may be included. They are regarded as non-exclusive affiliations: individuals can be said to belong to more than one. The term "household" may therefore have misleading implications in roster questions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Cognitive Study of Living Situations was undertaken in conjunction with a Census Bureau program of roster research. This research was designed to discover new ways of rostering which might help to alleviate differential undercoverage. The basis of the current research was the belief that certain individuals might be omitted from census counts because of respondents' difficulty in understanding the terminology used in questions and instructions. Difficulty might also arise in understanding the complex rules provided to respondents to guide them in enumerating their households. A qualitative study of the meanings attached to these terms and concepts was thought to be of use in assessing these potential sources of coverage error. The aim of the current study was to examine the overall fit between the terms and concepts used in questions in the decennial census and in surveys and the terms and concepts used naturally by respondents. The study was therefore designed to:

1. elicit naturally used terminology from respondents, and to inquire about the meanings of these terms;

2. to introduce census-based terminology to respondents and to inquire about the respondents' interpretations of these terms; and

3. to determine respondents' responses to selected living situations which were known to be associated with coverage error.

This report contains a description of the methods used in the Cognitive Study of Living Situations, an assessment of the fit between respondents' and census-based terminology, a description of the most salient aspects of respondents' residence concepts and an assessment of how these concepts interact with census-based rules of enumeration. Recommendations are provided in the final section of the report.

PART I. METHODS USED IN THE COGNITIVE STUDY OF LIVING SITUATIONS

A. Design of the Interview

The study was designed to include small number of intensive qualitative interviews. The interview employed thirteen specially prepared vignettes which presented hypothetical residence situations to respondents. Thirty vignettes were written, and 12 were chosen to be the basis of our interview through consultation with the participating ethnographers. An additional simple vignette was added to the beginning of the interview to serve as a training vignette to help respondents learn the interview task. These vignettes served as the basis of an interview of about one to one and a half hours in length.

The vignettes which were used were specially designed to elicit the vocabulary and concepts with which we were concerned. The design of the vignettes included the following features:

1. Ethnographic sources. The vignettes were culled, as much as possible, from ethnographic sources. These sources included previous ethnographic interviews on residence (Gerber, 1990), the Living Situation Survey pretest report (Research Triangle Institute, 1992), ethnographies commissioned by CSMR to examine the behavioral causes of undercount (See de la Puente, 1993, for a complete list) and a report by Aguirre International on the experience of Hispanics in the 1990 census (Kissam, et al. 1993). We wanted to present respondents with living situations which they might actually encounter, and which might therefore elicit the kinds of judgments which they are actually called upon to make in creating a census roster. In as much as possible, we used situations which are thought to be associated with undercoverage. These included children in joint custody or spending time with relatives other than parents, highly mobile persons, persons tenuously attached to several households, seasonal workers, doubled up families, and persons who move between group quarters and households. Although situations involving them were not found in our ethnographic sources, we added vignettes involving a college student and a live-in employee, because these situations are known to cause problems in enumeration. The vignettes are presented in the Appendix.

The ethnographic basis of the vignettes was critical to the success of the research. By providing respondents with situations they recognize as "real", we were able to tap into the expectations and reactions which they would have in similar social circumstances. This increases our confidence that the way respondents reasoned during our interviews is similar to the judgments they make in reporting rosters in survey situations.

2. Neutral vocabulary. One aim of the study was to investigate the vocabulary which respondents naturally use in describing residence. Our goal was to compare the terms used by respondents with those used in census and survey questions. As a result, the vignettes were written to avoid residence terms as much as possible. For example, the characters were described as sleeping in a certain place or spending time with a particular person, rather than as "living" or "visiting" there. Prior ethnographic research (Gerber, 1990) had indicated features of behavior associated with residence, which we employed in the wording of the vignettes. For example, the location of a person's belongings, arrangements about mail, and contributions made to households are all cues used in assessing residence. We employed these in writing the vignettes in order to suggest residence in different places.

3. Ambiguous situations. The vignettes were deliberately written to be ambiguous, in that they suggest more than one place where a character might be considered to live. This was done in part to model the kind of complex or ambiguous living situations which are believed to cause difficulties in enumeration. It also serves to present respondents with a cognitive problem which they were asked to resolve, stimulating thought and discussion. Respondents frequently commented on this aspect of the vignettes, saying that they were "vague", or comparing them to puzzles. Although the interview was experienced as challenging by some respondents, many of them seemed to enjoy the process. We successfully interviewed respondents with varying levels of education and fluency in English. Only in one instance was an interview terminated because the respondent was unable to complete the task.

Two additional tasks were added to the interview: a roster page from the 1990 Census, which respondents were asked to fill out for their own households, and a brief card sorting task. The roster page served primarily as a source of information for respondents for several probes, late in the interview, which asked about where particular individuals should be counted in the census. We have not analyzed these roster pages separately, since there is some evidence that the "hypothetical" nature of the interview influenced responses to the roster. Respondents may not have understood that we intended for them to create a factual account of their households. The card sorting task associated "household attachments", i.e. daily activities which were thought to indicate levels of attachments to households, with certain census based terms. The conversation around this task generated interesting data for the cognitive study. However, the card sort task itself was intended as a supplement to the study of these household attachments in the Living Situation Survey. Analysis of it will be presented in that context.

B. Questioning Strategies

The structured and unstructured probes used in the interviews will be described below.

1. Structured probes. The structured probes served to introduce specific Census based terminology about which we had a particular interest. These were "live", "household" and "usual residence", all of which occurred in the roster section of the 1990 Decennial Census. After a vignette was presented, we asked where certain characters lived, where their usual residence was, or if they were a member of a particular household.

We introduced the term "live" early in the interview. Since it is a term in universal usage (although people may define it differently) we did not think that it would interfere unduly with our attempt to collect naturally used residence terms. The use of "live" early in the interview proved to be important in training respondents in the task we had in mind. We had attempted to create a "neutral" probe, which would elicit residence terms without actually using any. This probe was "What would you call the time X spends with Y". Used after the training vignette (which describes a person "in town" and "sightseeing",) the neutral probe was often able to elicit residence-related terms (like "visit" and "vacation".) However, in other contexts the probe did not elicit terms relevant to residence. Respondents offered generalized descriptions of relationships or experiences, like "fun time" or "quality time" instead. Many respondents required the more focused probe, "Where does X live" in order to learn the task.

The remaining structured probes introduced the terms "household" and "usual residence", asked specifically where people should be counted in the Census, or were aimed at eliciting additional vocabulary.

2. Unstructured probes. Interviewers added many unstructured probes where necessary. These included standard think aloud probes, direct requests for meaning, and manipulation of the details of the vignette.

Typical think-aloud questions to elicit clarification and encourage talk were used, but were not the most important of our question strategies. We were not primarily engaged in modelling the respondents' immediate cognitive processes in response to particular survey questions. Maintaining a flow of self-description was therefore not our primary goal. We were not attempting to elicit responses which would be narrowly focussed on a specific question wording, but which would explore the ins and outs of the respondents' underlying understandings. This frequently required other, more direct questioning strategies.

One very productive questioning strategy was to directly ask about the meaning of a term. We asked the meaning both of the terms we introduced, and the terms which the respondent supplied. Direct requests for meaning were generally productive. They tended to be informal, rather than asking respondents for formal definitions. It should be pointed out that respondents are not consistent in their use of terms. In another context (perhaps the next vignette), respondents may offer responses which contradict their previous definitions. It was often useful to gently point this out to the respondent. This was only advisable if the respondent seemed to be generally comfortable with the task. If they were, they did not seem to mind having their inconsistencies pointed out.

Manipulating the details of a vignette were also frequently useful in clarifying the respondents' reasoning. By changing the details, and asking if the respondent's answer was correspondingly changed, it is possible to determine which of several factors is critical to the answer given. Since this was an important questioning strategy, it will be useful to supply an example:

A. Well, it seemed to me that if you had said he ate his meals and slept there, then I would consider that he lived there.
Q. ...if we said he eats at his wife's house, but he always sleeps at his mother's.
A. I'd say that's a weird arrangement.
Q. That's weird, but would you say that changed where he lived?
A. Well, if he slept at his mother's, I would consider that he lived at his mother's. On a permanent basis...if he just slept there occasionally, I would not consider that he lived there...

By separating the details of eating and sleeping, which the respondent had offered together, we are able to refine the respondent's definition of living somewhere. Respondents easily learned from us that the circumstances of the vignette could be changed, and supplied their own modifications. This sometimes seemed to result from the respondent's attempt to solve the "puzzle" presented by the odd or ambiguous details of the evolving story. They attempted to supply a reasonable set of circumstances, drawn from their own social experience, which would account for the details under discussion. The details of situations that were offered by respondents can be further manipulated by the interviewer.

The use and manipulation of hypothetical situations may have had one drawback. Once the respondents learned that "we can make it up any way you want," it sometimes became difficult for them to make a transition to more fact based parts of the interview. We included the first page of a 1990 Census form in our interview, and asked for a list of persons in the respondent's household. However, in several instances, the lists of names provided appear to have been as much fantasy as our vignettes. This suggests that it may be difficult to combine this form of interviewing with the collection of factual data.

C. Selection of respondents

Thirty six respondents, including African Americans, Whites, and Hispanics, were recruited through community organizations and personal contacts in the Washington D.C. area and in Boston. These groups were purposively chosen. Low income African Americans and Hispanics are known to be groups which are at risk of undercoverage. Middle class whites were included in the study because they are the group which most closely resemble the writers of census and survey questions. Their inclusion in the study allows us to examine the degree to which bureaucratically-based categories are rooted in the natural concepts and vocabulary of the question writers. It was also decided to interview some of the Hispanic respondents in English, since many Hispanics will be exposed to the English language form. The interview protocol was also translated into Spanish and interviews carried out in that language. Respondents were paid a $25 honorarium.

Three ethnographers (including Eleanor Gerber and Laurie Schwede of CSMR and Peter Hainer of Curry College,) carried out the English language interviews. Ten African American respondents were interviewed in Boston. These respondents included some of Peter Hainer's long time ethnographic respondents and contacts recruited through these people. These interviews have been analyzed for their cognitive and linguistic content in this report. Personal information was available about these respondents, so these interviews also provide the basis for an experiment, to be reported separately, assessing patterns of disclosure among this group. The African American and Hispanic respondents in the Washington D.C. area were recruited by Casa de Maryland, a community service organization in Takoma Park. They recruited one white respondent, seven African American respondents, six monolingual Hispanics, five bilingual Hispanics interviewed in English. Most of the Hispanic respondents were from El Salvador, and a few from Mexico. The Spanish language interviews were carried out by Lourdes Hartman, a native speaker of that language. In addition, seven white middle class respondents were recruited through neighborhood associations and at a library in the Washington metropolitan area. None of the D.C. area respondents were known to the ethnographers prior to the interview.

PART II. LINGUISTIC RESULTS

The following section presents our analysis of the way in which respondents use and understand residence terms. It should be pointed out that although our respondents were chosen to represent different ethnic groups, and in fact represented different levels of education, most of the interviews were done in one region of the United States. Other data suggest that there may be

variations in the use of these terms by regional dialect (Gerber and Bates, 1994). As a result, the application of these findings to all areas of the United States cannot be assessed without further research. Respondents natural use of residence terms, and their use of modifiers with them, will be discussed. The following section will also present the analysis of respondents' use of key census-based terms: live, stay, usual residence, and household.

A. Terms naturally used by respondents

As did respondents in previous research, (Gerber, 1993), respondents in this study naturally use a wide variety of terms to describe residence. The following section provides a sense of the range of terms that were used. They express a wide range of permanence in a person's connection to a place. In the following section, the most commonly used terms are presented in order of the degree of permanence they represent.

Permanence is not primarily measured by time. Rather, respondents are concerned with the overall stability of an individual's social connections to a place. Factors such as ownership, kinship, and a sense of belonging or participation are often important in deciding where someone lives. For example, if respondents have the impression that a vignette character owns a place, they are likely to say he "lives" there, even if the character is described as spending most of the year away from this place. Vignette characters will also be said to "live" with family members, even if the vignette specifies that they spend most of the week away.

The upper end of respondents' implicit scale of permanence is expressed by terms like "home", "permanent residence", "permanent address", "legal residence" and "legal address". The belief structures attached to these terms will be discussed fully later. Here, it is only necessary to note that the terms are similar to "home" in that social connection with place that they express is highly permanent. It is frequently calculated over long periods of a person's life. For example, "permanent residences" are understood to be places to which you are expected to return after long periods away working or at school. "Home" is similar in its degree of permanence, however, it has important emotional connotations that the other terms lack. "Home" is connected with comfort and a sense of belonging. Frequently, "home" will be calculated on the basis of kinship: "home" is assumed to be where a person's family is. These connections are more salient than a person's actual presence in the place. As a result, a parent's house where one does not live, or family land in the area where one grew up may sometimes be referred to as "home."

These interviews indicate that the term "residence" is used by many respondents, who represent all levels of education. The term is similar to "live" in the degree of permanence that it indicates. The two terms are sometimes used to help define each other:

> "...you got to be living some where, at least, what, a year or so before you can all it your residence or something."

It is possible that some forms of "residence" fall between "live" and "stay" on the scale. In the following passage, for example, "reside" is bracketed between "live" and "stay":

> Q. Staying means?
> A. Livin' there...even though it's temporary. [Pauses] Living, residing, staying too.

"Staying" is usually somewhere between "live" and "visit" in it's implication of fixity. A number of other terms apply to casual connections to places: terms like "vacation", "shacking", "hanging out" and the like may be applicable to presence in places which are not one's primary residence. The lower end of the scale is also characterized by a number of terms which indicate mobility or the lack of a fixed place. People who are connected with more than one residence are often described with mobility based terms like "traveling", "in transition" and "transient". (The latter term is more common than we had anticipated.)

Discussion: For most census purposes, the upper end of the permanence scale is inappropriate. These terms express long-term social attachments to a place, and the actual presence of a person in a "home" or a "legal address" is not seen as necessary to social assignment there. In addition, the census goal is often to include people who do not have the kinds of long-term attachments that people have in mind at the upper end of the scale. Since respondents often assume that we are interested primarily in these long term associations, an effective strategy might be to word questions so that they imply a range of more and less permanent attachments. "Live" and "stay" may not be adequate for this purpose, since other research has indicated that they mean the same thing to some people. However, other experiments could be tried. For example, the same effect might be achieved by asking about people "living here temporarily or permanently". "Residence" is a term which might be appropriate for inclusion in census questions because it is mid-range in permanence, and is naturally used by many respondents.

B. Use of modifiers

The scale of permanence is frequently expressed by the use of complex modifiers which qualify the base residence terms. People are often idiosyncratic in these modifiers: "a sturdy, stationary place to stay" was used by one respondent to indicate something like a stable residence. However, formulations like "home for the time being" and "staying there on a long term basis" are quite common. It is evident that the modifiers allow respondents to move base residence terms up and down the scale of permanence. Most frequently, modifiers alter the amount of time which is implied in the root residence term. They can have the effect of shifting a term on one end of the scale almost to the other. For example, a vignette describes a grandmother whose grandchildren "usually sleep" at her apartment. In this instance, the term "sleep", which implies little fixity is appropriate because most respondents do not see a shift of custody as having taken place. But the

children's connection is long-term, so a modifier is necessary. Thus, several respondents offered us formulations like this one: "she just babysits all the time." Short term connections may also be modified into even shorter versions, as in the formulations "mini-vacation" and "overnight visit."

The following example demonstrates how respondents use the modifiers to alter the degree of permanence implied by the base residence term:

> Q. What would you call the time that Lola spends with her sisters?
> A. Well they sound to me like visits. Maybe extended visits between both of those sisters...
> Q. How long does it have to be to be something besides an extended visit?
> A. Well, let's see, maybe if she spend let's say the summer with the sisters...Well, I'm trying to think here, let's see. I guess that would still be an extended visit if she spent the summer, but maybe if she spent like four to six months with them, then I'd say it was more than and extended visit.
> Q. What would it be then?
> A. Um. Well, it wouldn't really be living with them. Because she always goes back to her mother's, so maybe temporary living? Living temporarily with them? Living with them for a certain period of time?...Although, it says she's at her sisters, she leaves and she always goes back there. That would make me tend to feel that she considered her mother's sort of her home, more than any other place."

Describing this single situation, in which a girl shifts between her mother's and sisters' places, has required the respondent to use the modifiers extended, temporary, a certain period of time, always, sort of, and more than any other place. The modifiers alter the root residence terms to fit the mobility and ambiguity of the situation, and as such, are central to the respondent's expression of meaning.

Another important class of modifiers describe a person's relationship to a place. The most important of these are modifiers like "legal" and "official", which are generally used with terms like "residence" and "home" and "address". They refer to the belief that certain residences can be considered (by the person him or herself, or by various governmental agencies) as a person's primary place of attachment.

"Temporary" and "permanent" are used by many people, and seem to be generally understandable. We have chosen these words as analytic categories to discuss the implicit scale of permanence described above. However, people frequently use these terms as modifiers, in the ways we have already described. That is to say, they do not refer primarily to time, but to the stability of the social connection between a person and a place. As modifiers, they appear to shift residence terms in predictable directions, and to have wide understandability. Forms like "temporary home" or "permanent visit" do not occur naturally very often, but appear to shift the meaning of the base residence term in a predictable direction.

People do not appear to use "usual" or "usually" frequently as modifiers with any residence term. (The effects of combining "usual" with "residence" will be discussed below.)

Two other common modifiers should probably be investigated further. These are "just" and "only". People often use them to express dismissal of the importance of what they are talking about. It allows them to discount something as an element in their calculations. If a person is described as "just babysitting", or "just staying there", for example, it indicates the disqualification of that place as a real residence, regardless of the amount of time involved.

Discussion: Since respondents naturally use modifiers, it may be useful to include modifiers in census questions. The modifiers we have described shift the meanings of residence terms in predictable directions. They can therefore be used to reinforce the meanings which are otherwise difficult to communicate to respondents. In particular the modifiers "temporary" and "permanent" seem to be understandable. Used together, they will indicate the range of social connections to places that we want respondents to keep in mind in building rosters.

The modifiers "just", "only" and "usually" should be used very carefully with residence terms, if they are used at all. The first two appear to invite respondents to ignore whatever they modify. "Usually" does not occur naturally with residence terms. The effects of combining the modifier with residence will be reported later. Its effects in combination with other residence terminology should be carefully examined before it is included in other census questions.

C. Live and Stay

The terms "live" and "stay" are often used together in census roster questions. For example, in the 1990 Census, Question 1a. reads "List on the numbered lines below the name of each person living here on Sunday, April 1, including all persons staying here who have no other home." This use appears to imply a distinction between the two terms. One analytical goal of this study was to assess the kind and amount of similarity and difference which respondents see between the two terms. As a result, the terms will be treated together in this section.

Previous research (Gerber, 1990) found an important distinction which respondents made between the terms "live" and "stay." The current interviews confirm that most people cognitively distinguish between the two concepts. When they are asked to explain the difference between the two terms, their responses seem to be similar to those of the previous group of respondents. "Live" is generally used to express long-term, official, or stable connections with a place of residence. "Stay", on the other hand, expresses more temporary or less binding attachments to places. Respondents can often provide a distinction if explicitly asked to contrast the terms:

Q. Could you stay someplace without living there?
A. No, those are two different things, excuse me. There's a difference, because I could stay here tonight, but I don't live here...To stay is for a couple of days, live is permanent."

Respondents also make the distinction spontaneously, sometimes correcting themselves: "Where he stays. Where he lives, not stays, where he lives."

On the whole, the difference is usually expressed in terms of "temporary" vs. "permanent" attachments to a place. Time is sometimes described as a factor in this judgment of difference. Respondents may say that "live" represents a long time and "stay" a short time, but they vary in the amounts of time they invoke to explain the differences. However, they are likely to ignore time completely in many of their responses, especially if time does not clearly indicate what is considered temporary or permanent. Other elements also distinguish the terms. Lacking an element of ownership or control is frequently seen as intrinsic to staying somewhere. For example, one respondent explained that if you had a fight with your girlfriend, you might

> "...go to your partners house to chill out and stay for a week or so," but the place "is not yours, someone else's, you have no say-so over the door."

However, it is possible to "stay" in a place which is in fact your own, as long as it is not considered your main location. For example:

> "...I have a friend whose husband has to leave during the week to go work in another state, and he's back for the weekend. But I would consider him part of her family, her household, her residence, you know, he resides there. And whether he physically needs to go stay somewhere else, pay rent or something, it's part of the job, actually."

It appears that most respondents in this study will provide similar distinctions in certain situations. However, the terms are closely related in meaning, and respondents who provide linguistic distinctions like the ones quoted above often use the terms seemingly interchangeably in the next paragraph. And others, who explicitly told us that they meant the same thing, use them in contrast a few minutes later. However, almost all respondents use both words at times, and in many instances, these uses do not coincide with the explicit definitions with which they provide us.

This seems to indicate that there is considerable room for respondents to respond to the words as being similar. (In fact, other research indicates that more respondents in some areas of the country think the terms are similar than in other areas. Gerber and Bates, 1994.) Two factors account for the fact that these respondents sometimes use the words in contrast and sometimes use them to mean the same thing. The first is that both terms, as residence terms, are metaphors. In their root meanings they have implications different than their use as residence terms. The second is that respondents appear to use the terms in a highly contextual way.

1. Live and Stay as Metaphors. In its root meaning, "stay" means "to remain", and it is only in its use as a residence term, opposed to "live", that it takes on connotations of temporariness. Respondents in the cognitive study often seemed to switch back and forth between the more general and specific meanings of the term without marking the transition. This often makes it difficult to account for each use of the terms. For example, when a respondent says, "...if he's a good father, and he cares about the child, and stuff like that, why not? Let them stay with their father," it is difficult to assess whether "stay" is being used as a residence term or not. The respondent clearly means to indicate that the children should remain with their father, and this gives the term "stay" a permanent connotation in this context. This permanent connotation for "stay" also arises when the term is contrasted with "move". For example, one respondent first described the characters in one vignette as "living" together, but thought that the situation was too crowded.

> "...there's going to be trouble, they going to be saying who took my watermelon, who took this, everybody gonna be saying...we have to move, we cannot stay here."

Contrasted with "moving", the term "stay" clearly has permanent connotations. "Live" is also sometimes used by respondents in its root sense. It refers to existing or being alive. This sense sometimes controls respondents' use of the term in a residence context. For example, one respondent was willing to describe her stay at a shelter as "living there", because she did everything necessary to staying alive there. This makes the term "live" applicable to a very transitory situation. Because of the use of the terms in their root meanings, therefore, in some discussion of residence "live" may indicate temporary connections and "stay" may indicate permanent connections to places. This is true even for respondents who generally contrast the two terms in the opposite direction.

2. Contextual Use of "Live" and "Stay". Both "live" and "stay" are highly contextual terms. What they mean and how people use them varies by the specific linguistic context in which they occur. In order to understand this, it is necessary to shift the focus of semantic analysis. The words themselves probably do not carry fixed meanings in which a specific situation is describable in only one way. Rather, the terms are called forth by the degree of residential permanence or impermanence which a respondent wishes to stress at that particular juncture in the flow of conversation. As a result, the analysis must take into account a longer string of speech, in order to make these shifting meanings evident.

The response of the following respondent exemplifies the contextual way in which these words are frequently used. It is necessary to examine several consecutive responses in order to understand the respondents' use of the words. The background of this conversation is provided by a vignette which describes a mother who has sent her son out of a dangerous neighborhood to the grandmother's apartment.

Q. Where does Doris' son live?
A. I say, with his grandmother...Doris sends money there, he goes to school there, he sleeps there--she's sending money to support him there. Even though the mother still has a house or apartment...he's temporarily staying at his grandmother's house...
Q. So he's temporarily staying but he lives with his grandmother?
A. For now, yeah. Temporarily...The son is temporarily staying with the grandmother. So we call him being housed at the grandmother...She sent him to live with them, so I think he lives there...Because she has a reason. So I still think he's staying with the grandmother. Temporarily. Temporary resident...
Q. Where is the son's usual residence?
A. With the mother...cause her and her son live together and they're a family.

Despite the fluctuating use of the words live and stay, the respondent is really quite certain of her answer. The son is connected to his grandmother's place in a non-casual way, but he has a more permanent and stable attachment to the mother's. Her choice of the terms live and stay seem to be determined primarily by which aspect of the connection she wishes to stress. In the first answer, she points out first that the mother still has a place of her own, and these familial and economic ties are important in determining permanent attachment to places. By contrast, the grandmother's place is a more temporary attachment for the son, so the word "staying" is appropriate. But on the other hand, the mother intended for the son to remain with the grandmother, as she indicates in the second response. The mother "had a reason" and "sent him" to the grandmother. The connection is therefore non-casual, so the term "live" is also appropriate to the mother's arrangements for her son. The respondent stresses "staying" once again, and reinforces it with the modifier "temporarily." But this appears to make the connection almost too impermanent, so she reinforces the concept of "temporary" with "resident". Her final response, to the introduced concept of "usual residence", is framed by this respondent in terms of where the son is most closely bound by family ties. As a result, she offers the word "live" in the last response.

Discussion: This contextual use of terms means that the words "live" and "stay" cannot always be expected to carry the same meaning. The meanings of the terms will shift depending on the specific intentions and speech context of the respondent. If people contrast "stay" with something like "spend the night", then "stay" takes on connotations of permanence. Live may also be contrasted with other terms with more permanent connotations, (like home), and then live will indicate a relatively impermanent attachment.

The shifting nature of these terms makes it difficult to be certain precisely what context of meaning will be called forth in a respondent's mind by their use in a census question. Even for respondents who normally contrast "live" and "stay" as permanent and temporary, speech contexts exist which make the terms equivalent, or even reverse the polarity. It is therefore possible that questions using both terms may not always be understood as they are intended, even by respondents who frequently see the terms as contrasting. It seems advisable to reinforce these terms through the use of modifiers.

D. Usual Residence

The term "usual residence" is used in the 1990 Census as part of an explanation provided to respondents just prior to the roster question: "The 1990 census must count every person at his or her "usual residence". This means the place where the person lives and sleeps most of the time." We wanted to assess whether or not this term is naturally used by respondents, and what it means to them when it is introduced. Therefore, the probe "What is X's usual residence" was introduced after the ninth vignette.

The evidence about the natural use of the term "usual residence" is unequivocal. No respondent ever used the term to us before it was introduced in our probes. We can therefore conclude that the term is not part of the natural vocabulary of any of our respondents. Therefore, it seems likely that respondents' reactions to the term "usual residence" when it is presented to them in the census context is calculated from their understanding of the component terms. This section reports the meanings naturally attached to "residence" and the effects of combining this concept with the modifier "usual".

As described previously, the term "residence" is often modified into forms like "permanent residence, legal residence" and the like. The modified terms all have connotations of greater permanence than either "live", "stay", or unmodified "residence". In discussing mobile people, respondents sometimes associate "permanent residence" with places that a person does not "live" at the moment, but with which he/she continues to maintain a long term social connection. Any place where one maintains a long lasting address may be referred to as a "permanent residence". (In this sense, "permanent residence" is commonly associated with applications which ask for a permanent and local address. Respondents also use the related form "legal address", often interchangeably with "legal residence.")

Although respondents use many forms of the term residence, it is not naturally used with the modifier "usual". The term "usual residence" is unfamiliar, and does not seem to result in a calculation of where a person lives "most of the time". When "usual" is presented with "residence", respondents frequently alter the term in their replies, as though the two words simply don't combine. For example:

> Q. Where is Steve's usual residence?
> A. College?...Or his mother's house? His usual?
> Q. Usual residence
> A. His mother's That's it. That's his <u>new residence</u>...
> [R. asks for an explanation of the question.] Explain that to me...
> <u>usual schedule</u>, right? in other words.

As the previous discussion indicates, "residence" is a term which is generally modified to indicate a high level of permanence. It is almost never modified to indicate a more temporary or transient connection: that is to say, phrases like "residence for the time being" or "tonight's residence" do not generally occur.

As a result, when it is introduced to respondents, the census term "usual residence", which modifies the term in the direction of more temporariness, is experienced as unusual or confusing. The following passage gives an example of this reaction:

> Q. ...Where is the son's usual residence?
> A. Usual? (Pause)
> Q. Residence.
> A. (Low murmur) Usual, usual, his beg--<u>beginning</u>...his usual residence?...Usual, what you mean, usual? <u>So-so, off and on,</u> something like that?
> Q. Whatever it means to you.
> A. Usual, I guess that would be <u>most of the time</u>, I guess. Because if you say often, it could be <u>often</u>, most of the time.

The respondent in the passage above has tried out many definitions of "usual", including beginning, so-so, off and on, and often, before arriving at the census-approved formulation of "most of the time." Most reactions to our introduction of the term are not this extreme. However, respondents often indicate discomfort with the term by ignoring it or transforming it into something more familiar. That is to say, when we ask where a vignette character's "usual residence" is, respondents tend to replace it in their answers with "home", "permanent residence", "live", unmodified "residence" etc.

There is some evidence that introducing the term "usual" confuses respondents because it suggests to them that we assume the existence of <u>another</u> place besides their primary one.

> Q. What does usual residence mean to you?
> A. Well, I guess it's a place where you normally live or usually live. But it also indicates that there might be someplace else you go sometime.

Or the following, from another respondent:

> Q. Where is the son's usual residence?
> A. I would say he usually resident, it could be, ahhh, out--livin' somewhere else.

Another respondent answered a usual residence probe with the phrase "Someone who just stay there...usual residence." This association with "just staying" indicates that "usual residence" has been disqualified as a permanent place. The term seems, in some circumstances, to indicate a temporary association with a dwelling place. This may be confusing for people who have only one residence. Since they would naturally describe their single, or their most stable place as "permanent residence", it seems possible that, in asking for "usual residence", we may give the impression that we are interested in the <u>less</u> stable of two possible places. This reaction to "usual residence" is what may have conditioned the first respondent's initial association of the term with "off and on" and "so-so".

Discussion: The census term "usual residence" is intended to create a calculation of where rostered individuals "live and sleep most of the time." However, because of the term's relation to other words not used in the questionnaire, it is not understood in this way by our respondents. If respondents simply ignore the "usual", they are left with unmodified "residence", yielding a meaning that is reasonably close to the term "live". Although it does not involve a calculation of time, the concept is reasonably close to census intentions. However, respondents also replace the term, and create modifications like "permanent residence." This is inappropriate to the intended meaning. Even when they attend to the word "usual", they do it in the context of what they expect to hear, and create an implicit contrast between "usual" and "permanent", which is equally misleading. Fortunately, this potential for misunderstanding is easily dealt with. The term is not part of a census question, but occurs only in an introductory explanation which can be easily eliminated. The concept of "usual residence" should be regarded as an in-house bureaucratic category which is neither useful nor appropriate to communicate to respondents.

The analysis of "usual residence" makes clear that the wording of census questionnaires cannot be evaluated in isolation from the natural linguistic practices of respondents. Their reactions to the term "usual residence" must be understood in the context of what they are familiar with or expect to hear. Unfamiliarity is often dealt with by replacing an artificial concept with one in more common use. Mentally altering unfamiliar terms into familiar patterns may have, as we have seen here, very misleading consequences. It therefore seems prudent to include an investigation of naturally used terminology and concepts in the testing of new census questions.

E. Household

The term "household" was also of interest to us, because it is used in the census and in surveys. In the 1990 Census, the term is included in the rostering instructions for Question 1: "Begin on line 1 with the household member (or one of the household members) in whose name this house or apartment is owned, being bought or rented. If there is no such person, start on line 1 with any adult household member."

In this study, only two respondents used the term naturally, that is to say, introduced it into their answers prior to the use of the term in probes. Some respondents continue to ignore the term even after hearing it from us, and tend to transform it into other terms with which they feel more comfortable. Thus, a question asking about household membership will frequently be answered in terms of where a person "lives" or where his/her "home" is. Other respondents do pick up the term after it is used in probes, although they may not define it the way that the writers of census questions intend. A few respondents indicated that the terms sounded "technical" or strange to them. One respondent's only association with the term was the stamp "household goods" which he had seen on shipping crates in the Army.

The vignettes elicited discussions of household membership of various characters. This allowed us to assess what "household" means to people, even if they are not very familiar with the term. Most significantly, they do not

see "household" as being identical with a particular housing unit: everyone in the same house or apartment is not necessarily considered to be members of a single household.

One of our vignettes described an apartment in which a couple and their children rented bedrooms to another couple and to a cousin and his friends. (This situation was taken from ethnographic studies which identified such complex housing arrangements as common among Latino immigrants.) Although some respondents are willing to include everyone present in the same household, other respondents define the household there as the family of the renters, excluding the boarders. Some see three households, following the natural social units involved. Occasionally a respondent wavered between both calculations. The following respondent associated the word "household" with "householder" as well, so he is not clear as to whether there are one, two, or three households in the situation described above.

> Q. So how many households are there?
> A. One, two, three. Three households...Oh, no, no, two...Two cause the one that bought the apartment is just the wife and husband right? So there are only two people. There are only two households. (The other people) live there, yes...but they not part of the household. They can leave whenever they want to.

The term "household" seems to indicate a social rather than a spatial unit. The most important social ties with which people are concerned are kinship and economic cooperation. Friendship is also seen as a tie which can create a household, but only if it is seen as creating sharing and cooperative effort. Only natural social units, characterized by these social ties, are likely to be counted as "households". Presence in the housing unit is not enough to qualify one as a member: often respondents insist on active social participation. Some insisted that if adults do not contribute work or money to the unit, they cannot be considered members, even if they are there for a considerable period of time. (The term "free-loader" tends to come up in this context.) However, the criterion of economic cooperation does not apply to children or others who are understood as justifiably dependent (like an elderly grandfather in one of our vignettes.)

Because social ties are at the heart of respondents' understanding of "household", they do not see it as an exclusive affiliation. It is possible to be counted as a member of more than one household. This seems to be calculated primarily on the basis of kinship. For instance, both children and adults are sometimes ascribed household membership in the homes of female kin even when they do not live there:

> Q. Is Dennis a member of his mother's household?
> A. Yeah, he's her son. Yeah, by being her child. A child is always--well no, cause if he has to live there--well yeah, I say yeah.

Other respondents are likely to count husbands and wives as members of the same household on the basis of the marriage tie, regardless of where they may be living.

Discussion: The term household has a complex technical definition in the census and surveys. It is intended to include un-related persons who are present in housing units, as it is intended to exclude persons who do not primarily live there. However, our respondents do not understand the concept in this way. They tend to define "households" as naturally occurring social units, defined by the bonds of kinship and marriage, and by social cooperation. They are willing to include persons in households on the sole basis of kinship, and to assign individuals to more than one household. There is currently no attempt on the decennial census form to define "household" or to communicate the differences between the bureaucratic concept and the natural one. However, considering the salience of natural social units to respondents, this might be difficult to accomplish. Since the term does not occur in a primary rostering instruction, it might be easier to reword the instruction to exclude the term.

PART III. RESPONDENTS' REACTIONS TO LIVING SITUATIONS

One aim of the study was to assess the fit between respondents' concepts of where a person lives and the Census Bureau's rules of enumeration. Our vignettes were designed to elicit judgments about certain categories of persons for whom problems in enumeration are thought to exist. The following section of this report discusses our findings about these categories of persons. Some additional features of the respondents' understanding of residence are also discussed.

A. Homeless and tenuously attached persons

The issue of homelessness can be looked at from two different perspectives: the homeless person's and that of household respondents who may occasionally provide space for homeless persons. Homeless persons are supposed to be enumerated where they are found on Census Day. The following section suggests some differences which the experience of homelessness might make in the residence concepts of those who have experienced it. It also provides some insights as to how respondents who are housed might conceptualize the homeless persons who are occasionally stay with them.

Our respondents included several persons who were currently or who had been homeless. (We did not collect this information systematically, so it is not possible to be certain of how many there were.) However, this experience proved to be highly salient to some of these respondents, who were more than ready to express their views about it. In general their responses to our vignettes were very similar to those of the rest of the respondents. However, in at least two instances, there seemed to be alterations in the use of the word "live" for formerly homeless respondents. In one instance, a respondent was willing to use the term to describe being in a shelter, which most respondents do not do:

A. No, he's still <u>living</u>, he's still sleeping and eating somewhere...
Q. So you can say somebody lives at the shelter?
A. Yeah. Cause I've <u>lived</u> in a shelter before.
Q. What makes it living there?

A. You sleep, you eat, you bathe there, watch T.V. there, you have rules there just like you do at home, um, the shelter's <u>just like</u> you're <u>living in a home</u>...but you don't have the privacy and you're not in good spirit, because you're down and out because you're <u>homeless</u>. Because I've been homeless before, so I know...you can be <u>homeless and live in a shelter.</u>

Another formerly homeless respondent would not describe the shelter experience as "living there", but termed it "surviving" and "existing." It seems possible, therefore, that for some persons who have experienced homelessness, the term "live" may be altered in meaning. It may become more closely associated with the root meaning of the term (described above) than it is with its residence meaning. If these very tentative findings are more general in the homeless population, it suggests that some residence terms may not be understood in the same way by people who are or have been homeless. This might have consequences for the wording of questionnaires intended for the enumeration of the homeless. Further research should be done to examine the effects of homelessness on residence concepts.

Homelessness also has to be looked at from the perspective of those persons who provide space temporarily in households to homeless persons. It is apparent that for most respondents, there is a considerable grey area in the definition of who is "homeless". Our vignettes contain two examples of highly mobile persons who might be considered homeless. One describes "Lola", who moves between the residences of her sisters and her mother. The vignette included the information that "no matter how long she spends at her sisters' places, eventually she goes back to her mother's house". A few respondents were willing to describe her as homeless, but this was not the most common reaction. The phrase "eventually goes back to her mother's house" was frequently associated with the idea that the mother's place must be her "home." This is consistent with the common understanding of residence which measures long term social associations of persons to places, and not necessarily their actual presence in them. Therefore, if the mother's place is "home" in a social sense, it is not logical to conclude that she is "homeless." However, some respondents felt that she was "like homeless" even if it couldn't quite be described in that way. Interestingly, when Lola was assumed to be young, the tendency to place her with her mother was strongest. Others evaded the judgment by saying that she was "living with family". This is a convenient way of avoiding placing her definitively in one of the households. This suggests that when persons without their own residences are connected with family members, even when they are described as being highly mobile, they may not be cognitively evaluated as homeless. It is not clear whether respondents would list people they see as "living with family" on their rosters for Census day if there is some place they expect (rightly or wrongly) that the person would be listed.

A second vignette describes a man who "leaves his house in the country" to work in the city for seven months out of the year. He is described as sleeping at campgrounds, with friends, and in shelters, while he is in the city. Some respondents did see him as being homeless while he was in the city, largely because of the mention of the shelter in the vignette. However, most respondents take their cue from the phrase "leaves his house in the

country". Despite the fact that he spends most of his time away, this character tends to be associated with the place that respondents can imagine that he possesses. They are likely to assume that he has family in the country, and picture his tax forms and mail going to this house. As a result, he is frequently assigned as "living" in a place where he spends less than half the year, and cues to homelessness in the vignette are ignored.

Discussion: The grey area in the definition of homelessness is potentially important to census rosters. Census rules require that homeless persons are to be rostered in the places where they are found on Census Day. On the 1990 Census form, Question 1a instructs respondents to include "all persons staying here who have no other home." It seems possible, however, that some highly mobile persons who "float" from residence to residence may be seen as having socially defined "homes", even if they are seldom present in them. This is likely to be true if an otherwise homeless person is still connected with a parent's place, where they may be cognitively and emotionally categorized as members. Respondents may see such persons as "belonging" somewhere, and therefore fail to roster them on Census day.

The case is even more complicated for individuals who serially stay with various family members. People "living with family" are not generally seen as homeless, but it is not clear to which relative's place they primarily belong. Respondents in the alternative places may have conflicting versions about where such highly mobile persons live. This could as easily cause omission as it could double counting.

The examples presented above are the examples of "grey area" homeless persons which were elicited by the particular vignettes which we chose. There are probably many other situations in which a definition of "homelessness" is difficult for respondents to make. Further research would be useful in identifying these situations.

B. The assumed other place

One interesting pattern of response was the assumption made in certain circumstances that particular individuals "must" have a house or apartment of their own. This was read off of the demographic and social characteristics of the individuals involved. One vignette describes a grandfather in a nursing home who may eventually go to live with a granddaughter. Neither the granddaughter's place or the nursing home was chosen as his residence by most respondents. They frequently assumed that he must have had a prior residence of his own, even though such a place was not mentioned in the vignette. It was to this assumed place that he was frequently assigned as "living."

The response described above rests on the expectations people have about grandfathers and the lives they must have lived in order to achieve their respected old age. This became clear when one Hispanic respondent (interviewed in English) heard the word "grandfather" translated into "abuelo." Hearing the word in his native language suddenly clarified his previously tentative response:

Q. Grandfather, what is that in Spanish, 'abuelo'?
A. Abuelo has to have a place! Yes, he's an older guy, he has a place.
Q. So it sounds funny to talk about him living with his granddaughter?
A. Yes, yes. I'm saying, maybe he's staying in there and somewhere in the country, because if he don't got no house, what did he did when he was young?...Just have sex and have kids and don't think about a house, you know.

The respondent seems here to be reasoning from a social assumption that "grandfathers" are socially responsible people, and must be assumed to have lived in such a way that they have permanent residences. This, or a similar logic, probably controls the response given by several other respondents that the grandfather's "usual residence" is "at home 'til he got sick."

Other life-styles sometimes carry the assumption of the existence of another place, even if the degree of respect attached to it is less. One of our vignettes describes a man who spends two nights a week with his child and the child's mother, and might have another child elsewhere. To many respondents he seems "homeless", or something approaching that: "just jockeying from position to position, so it doesn't seem like he's homeless but basically he is." However, some respondents read a third place, belonging to the character himself, into the vignette:

A. Well, I could picture that he probably has an apartment or something that he rents, and um, stays there most of the time.

This is based on an evaluation of the difficulties of the man's life-style:

A. ..He'd probably be with himself, really, in his own apartment. I know would if I had three four women like that. You know.

One respondent who took this approach pointed out that if he had enough money for multiple women, he must have money for a place of his own. Another reasoned that if he could provide things for his child he "must have a job", and therefore also had a place to live. This reasoning could clearly affect the rostering of men who are tenuously attached to households but are known to be working. There may be a tendency for respondents to assume that anyone with a job could not possibly be homeless, and therefore to exclude them from a census day roster.

Discussion: This tendency to make assumptions about the existence of other places may have effects on real rosters. In the 1990 Census, individuals "with no usual home elsewhere" were supposed to be counted at the place where they were found on Census day. However, respondents who lack specific information about highly mobile people may tend to assume the existence of a valid residence, based on other aspects of the individual's life-style. Presumably, this would make them less likely to include such mobile persons on their rosters as having "no usual home elsewhere." This suggests that research should be done on the actual extent of knowledge that space providers have about the alternative residences of highly mobile or tenuously attached persons.

The tendency to assume the existence of other residences may affect the enumeration of homeless persons. Respondents who provide space to highly mobile persons may not possess complete social information about them. As we have seen, this reasoning is applied to men who have connections with several women. If all of the female space providers make the same judgment, this assumption creates a bias against anyone rostering the man in question.

Current census rules and procedures assume that a central household respondent can account for the whereabouts of everyone he or she is required to roster at all times. For example, these proxy respondents are assumed to know where others are during the week while working, whether an absent person was in jail or in a general hospital on census day, and whether or not the mobile persons who stay with them have a residence elsewhere. This set of assumptions is unlikely to be true in all cases. The more mobile and complex the living situations which the respondent has to account for, the less likely it is to be true. Further research should be done to examine how people deal with rosters in the absence of complete information. The patterns of what is known or not known about persons in certain social roles or living situations may be useful in a reevaluation of census rules and procedures.

C. The residence of children

The residence of children is calculated differently than that of adults. The main judgment involved is about who has primary responsibility for the children. This far outweighs any other factor in our vignettes, including the actual presence of the child in another place than that of the primary guardian. This becomes evident in examining two of our vignettes, which make a particularly good comparison for this topic. One of our vignettes describes a grandmother whose grandchildren sleep at her apartment "most nights". The children's parents are explicitly described as renting apartments nearby, although they are described as eating in the grandmother's home. Another describes a mother who has sent her child to a grandmother's house to go to school in a safer neighborhood. The child is described as eating at his mother's house frequently, although he sleeps at the grandmother's. It would seem that the situations are similar, because the children both sleep at their grandmothers' places. However, these two vignettes are handled in very different ways by our respondents.

A significant detail for many respondents in the second vignette were the payments the mother gave to the grandmother for the support of her son. Many thought that it indicated that the grandmother was now the primary custodian, and assigned residence to the grandmother's house. Others seemed to feel that the fact that the mother was still financially responsible was an indication that custody remained with her. The answers are completely different, but the reasoning processes follow an identical pattern: the search for the adult who is primarily responsible for the child. Respondents were using the detail about the money as an indicator of whether or not the decision making authority for the children had changed hands. In the other vignette, where children were described as "usually sleeping" at a grandmother's apartment, no such cues to changes in custody were provided. In this case, the grandmother was almost always seen as "babysitting" or "just babysitting". The children were assigned to the residence of their mother. Respondents frequently

disqualify the grandmother's place as a residence because they see her connection to the children as emotional and unofficial. That is, she babysits because she "just loves" the grandchildren, so she asks them to "stay over all the time." The cognitive search for the custodial parent is also apparent in another vignette, which describes children who spend some time with a divorced father. In this case, the mother was generally assumed to be the custodial parent because she had the children during the week most of the year. In this case respondents often assume that there has been a court decision about the custody of the children, and tend to call the time the children spend with their father "visitation". It should be noted that we did not test a vignette in which mother and father had equal time with their children. On the occasions when this vignette manipulation was introduced, respondents were generally willing to say that the children "lived" with both parents. Again, they assumed that this was an official court-ordered situation.

Discussion: The only special rostering rules provided for children on the 1990 Census form involve "special cases", such as newborn babies still in the hospital or children in boarding schools or colleges. Other than this, it seems to have been assumed that general rostering instructions are adequate to guide respondents in the rostering of children. However, these data indicate that respondents think differently about the residence of children than they do about the residence of adults. Children appear to be regarded as "living with" the person who has legal or agreed upon custody of the child. Adults are likely to be assigned to the place where they are most stably connected over time, however this social attachment is measured. But in thinking about children, respondents do not think about attachments to places, they think about attachments to persons. As a result, actual location is even less important a factor in the residence of children than it is in the residence of adults.

This research cannot estimate how large a problem in enumeration this set of understandings is likely to cause. Our respondents seemed to prefer the mother's place as the child's residence. Difficulties in enumeration would occur in the case of children who spend a great deal of time "unofficially" with relatives other than the custodial parent. Further research would be necessary to establish how common this is, and whether it has differential effects on the coverage of children of different groups.

D. Legal or official address

One important approach to calculating residence is to assign a person to the residence where they maintain their most stable or official address. We have already seen that the most common alterations of the term residence are "legal" residence and "permanent residence". These concepts often occur in the same contexts with "legal address" and "official address", which sometimes replace them in conversation. This section describes the set of beliefs and assumptions that underlie these usages.

A variety of factors influence where a "permanent residence" is thought to be. For many respondents, one's permanent residence is where one claims it is. This process is sometimes called "establishing a residence." Establishing a

residence is an element in creating and maintaining a respectable social identity. By listing an address on a driver's license, IRS forms, credit card bills, and the like, individuals create a consistent official base for themselves. "Permanent residence" is therefore sometimes defined as "where you get your legal or official mail." Not all correspondence is equal: personal mail might come to any address with which one is associated. For children, the permanent residence may be indicated by the address which is given to a school district. When there is more than one possible place, the "permanent residence" is often seen as a matter of choice. In ambiguous cases, therefore, respondents tend to ask first which place the individual represents as their residence. (However, their judgements are influenced by other factors, such as kinship. Young people in particular may be seen as having a "permanent residence" or "home" with their parents, even when they no longer actually live there.) The highly permanent forms "permanent residence" and "permanent address" seem to have connotations which make them inappropriate for use in roster questions.

Some people assume that a person should be counted as "living" at the place where he or she gets important or official mail. Financial and governmental definitions of a person's address are most often mentioned. According to this view, the place where parole officers, the bank, the IRS or the Department of Motor Vehicles can contact a person defines that person's residence. Respondents see the possibility clearly that individuals may not live or stay full time at these addresses, although in most cases they would. Respondents often assume that an address for "important mail" is maintained because that location is the most permanent or stable of the locations to which a person is attached. For example, if a person moves frequently, or is living somewhere for a defined and limited time, they may choose to maintain a "legal" or "permanent" address at a place at an address to which they will eventually return. This usage is similar to the distinction between "permanent" and "local" address which respondents are used to seeing on applications of all types. There is some evidence that certain respondents may assume that census questions (especially the ones that mention the word address) are about a person's "permanent address." As a result, some respondents may not believe we are asking about a person's physical location at all.

Respondents' belief in a legal or official aspect to residence is reinforced by their knowledge and expectations about non-Census governmental or bureaucratic functions. One of their most important assumptions is that Census rules and definitions are the same as those they are familiar with from other agencies. This may explain why respondents are sometimes willing to say that certain individuals "live" with them, but do not believe that they are supposed to be counted with them in the Census. For example:

A. Let me think about this again. The dependency defines the household for the purposes of the IRS. If my son came back...he was living at home for awhile and working. I would say he is a part of my household, but actually he is just living there. I think that in the legal sense, it would just be my wife and myself. If the census people came by, he would be, well, I guess it would be his home, but he is not part of our household. He uses our address, but he is not an owner, not a dependent, he files his own tax return."

This indicates that despite a tendency to think his son was living with him, despite believing it is his home, he might not include his son as a member of the household for Census purposes. This clearly is based on an assumption that the census and the IRS are interested in the same unit, which is thought to have a legal basis. The same respondent remarked, in another context: "It's the overall pattern of her legal relationships that define what her residence is."

Discussion: The belief that residence has a legal aspect defined by social authorities like governments and banks is rather common. Probably no other belief has a greater effect on the rosters that respondents provide than this one. It radically alters the respondents' basic understanding of what we are asking. Through their experiences with other bureaucracies and institutions, respondents have formed a concept of what our questions must mean; unfortunately this does not correspond to the questions' original intents in many cases. The belief strongly biases rosters in the direction of listing the most stable residents over long periods of time (regardless of where they are currently located,) and of excluding persons whose associations with the place do not have this quasi-legal status (regardless of how long they are there.)

This suggests that census forms should include various means of countering this tendency. Providing specific wording to reinforce the rostering of "temporary" persons may be helpful, since the respondents' natural bias leads in the other direction. It may also be a good idea to provide specific questions which allow the removal of socially "permanent" persons who are no longer present.

E. Persons moving between group quarters and housing units

Two of our vignettes were designed to assess respondents' reactions to persons who move between group quarters and housing units. One involved a nursing home, and one involved prison. In general, the responses to these situations seemed to be governed by the various forms of reasoning which we have already discussed. That is to say, as far as can be established here, respondents do not have a separate set of understandings which apply to residence in group quarters or institutional situations.

The nursing home vignette called forth a search for the residence which was thought to be most stable over time. As we have seen, they tended to ascribe this to the home he was assumed to have had before becoming ill. The prison vignette described two men who have given the address of a female relative to their parole officers, and spend time there during the day, but not at night. Two forms of reasoning emerged for this situation. For some respondents, the men seem to have some other place to spend their nights, and would prefer to ascribe them to that place if they had enough information. A few thought that prison should be counted as their most stable residence, (since they are described in the vignette as "spending most of their adult lives in prison.") But more frequently, respondents reacted to the statement in the vignette that the female relative's address had been given to the parole officer. This made the address the men's "legal address", sanctioned by a government bureaucracy, which overbalanced any other consideration.

Discussion: The current research is inadequate to draw any firm conclusions about the rostering of persons moving between group quarters and households. We included only two vignettes that touched upon this issue. In both, lines of reasoning not specific to group quarters were elicited from our respondents. Further research would be needed to determine if no specific beliefs about residence in group quarters exist, or if our vignettes simply failed to tap into them.

F. College students

A vignette was included to examine respondents' reactions to the residence of college students who spend most of their time at the college address, but maintain a significant connection to their parent's home. For many respondents, it was apparent that the college students should be counted with their parents. The reasoning followed by some of these respondents has already been discussed. They observe that the parents' home is often listed as a "permanent address" in college records, and assume that this is what the census question must be asking about. Our vignette may have reminded respondents of this by specifying that the student's grades are received at his parents' address.

However, "permanent address" was not the only important factor in their reasoning. College addresses seem temporary to some respondents, even when it is pointed out to them that the period in question might be four years or more. It is "temporary" because respondents are looking for the most stable residence a person has, over a long period, and the parents' home is likely to qualify as that. Some people stressed this by describing the instability of dorm and college apartment arrangements, or emphasized that the student would eventually return to the parents' house.

In addition, college students are often financially dependent, and their parents may still have decision making authority over them. Therefore, as "children", college students are to be counted with their parents. Some respondents also point out that college students are IRS deductions for their parents, which makes the parents' place appear to be a form of governmentally sanctioned "legal residence."

Despite the many logical avenues for concluding that college students should be counted with their parents, this opinion was not quite universal. Students were understood to "live" at college by some respondents. These respondents tended to see the situation more from the college students' point of view than from that of the parents. For example, one young respondent saw college students as being, similar to himself, clearly able to be independent. This meant that he did not apply the childhood or financial dependency criteria to their situation. Another worked as a cook at a nearby university, and was very familiar with college schedules. He was impressed with the small amount of time that students might actually spend with their parents and was willing to conclude that college was their primary residence. Unfortunately, no current college students were included among our respondents.

It seems that parents and students potentially differ in point of view about where a college student should be counted. The parent's viewpoint requires the child to be listed with them, but there are indications that the students themselves might stress independence and wish to be counted at college. It seems therefore that double enumeration of college students is a likely outcome.

Discussion: It is known that college students are frequently erroneously enumerated. Our results provide a context for understanding this. For parents, listing college students in their homes is a natural judgment from several points of view (as still dependent children, as persons returning "home" after an absence in a "temporary" place, and as persons who regard the place as their "legal residence".) The census instruction about college students relies on a logic of location rather than one of social attachment. However, the social attachments which link college students to their parents' homes are powerful ones. It is therefore difficult to imagine any set of instructions which would counter parents' tendency to list college children with them. It may prove far easier to change the census rule than to change this ingrained pattern of behavior.

G. Work

Two of our vignettes included situations designed to elicit respondents' understandings about how work affects issues of residence. One vignette describes a man who migrates seasonally to the city and stays in a number of places, and the other describes a live-in housekeeper who spends weekends with her husband and children. A few respondents were willing to decide the residence of these characters on the basis of time, but for most, the job itself was a critical detail. Although the situations are very different in terms of time and the number of alternate residences involved, the two look very similar to most respondents. Both situations involve residence situations which people choose for no other reason than to make a living. The general assessment of our respondents is that residences which people have "only for work" or "just for work" do not count as primary or important attachments. (Residences qualified by the use of the modifiers "just" and "only" have been dismissed as serious residence alternatives. Work is one of the most important contexts in which these modifiers are used.)

Respondents were generally familiar with such situations among their friends or neighbors. Middle class respondents mentioned a model and a contractor with apartments in other cities; while poor respondents described men similar to the character in our vignette who migrate for construction or other work during the summer months and who may sleep in cars or in a shelter. Despite these enormous social disparities, respondents agree that these work-related places are not where the characters "usually live." If an individual is somewhere "just for work", the <u>other</u> place is the preferred residence choice.

This is sometimes described in terms of the mentioned or assumed kinship relations of the characters: they are understood to belong with their families. This is most explicit in the case of the housekeeper, whose children are part of the narrative of the vignette. (A number of respondents were ready to criticize her for not being with her children enough.)

However, the housekeeper's job would not have seemed like a genuine residence even if her family had not been mentioned. This was because the job itself is seen as being inherently temporary. No matter how long a housekeeper has had her job, she might still be fired, so the situation is regarded as intrinsically unstable. This logic was explicitly extended to census enumeration:

> Q. Where should Alberta be counted in the Census?
> A. Um. I think at her home with her husband and family. Because to me she could lose this job at any time, and then she'd be right back home full time...
> Q. Where does Alberta live?
> A. I'd have to say with her family...because once again I feel like she's living with these people she's working for...for the time being because that's the situation she's in with this job, right now but it might not always have been or always will be that same way."

However, when respondents see servants as being "almost like members of the family", they are more likely to see the housekeeper as belonging to her employer's household. This response was given several times by Hispanic respondents who were interviewed in Spanish.

There is some indication that if the residence is seen as existing for other reasons besides work, the job may actually add to a sense of permanence. For example, in discussing the "floater" who moved between her sisters and her mother's homes, a small number of respondents wanted to know if she had a job in one of those locations. If she did, that might mean that she was "establishing a residence" there.

Discussion: The disqualification of residences maintained "only for work" is a logical corollary of the interpretation of residence in terms of social ties. Places where people work are unlikely to be selected as residences if other, more socially natural, residences exist. One limitation of our research is that we did not examine respondents reactions to the residence of live-in employees if they have no compelling alternate social residence. Further research would be necessary to resolve this point.

PART IV. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS

In a qualitative study such as this one, it is difficult to draw any certain conclusions about variation or the lack of it. The respondents were not sampled to represent the population, and the interviews we carried out differed from each other considerably after the presentation of the original vignette. As a result, we have not quantified our results. We have more confidence in describing a range of variability in concepts and terms than in drawing conclusions about the frequency with which such responses occur within the population.

However, this study was designed to capture at least an impression of major differences between ethnic groups with respect to their key terms and concepts about residence. It was reasonable to assume that different sub-cultures might have different views, based on their different residential experiences.

The ethnographic work we examined in order to create the vignettes indicated some differences in residence and household structure by ethnic group. For example, we expected the experience of migration to be particularly salient to Hispanics, and to determine residence patterns. African American family structure has long been understood be characterized by wide ranging extended kin units, which maintain social and economic cooperation over long periods of time. We had chosen the low-income African American and Hispanic groups to discover if any terms or concepts in use in those undercounted populations might create difficulties in the interpretation of census questions. Our hypothesis about the middle class white group was that their terms and concepts might be more similar to those used in census questions. Therefore, we expected fewer misunderstandings to occur.

However, the major patterns of difference which we had been expecting failed to emerge between the groups of respondents interviewed in English. The group differences which can be identified among the English-speaking respondents are not fundamental. That is to say, the same major concepts seem to govern the understanding of residence in all three groups. "Usual residence" is not used by anyone, and is found confusing in all groups. "Household" is seldom used, and is interpreted as a non-exclusive social unit by everyone. Respondents treat the residence of children similarly in all groups. Respondents from all groups frequently disqualify work related residences as genuine places to live. Respondents in all groups search for the most stable residence over time to assign a person to, and individuals in all groups attend to definitions of residence based on mail, or officially recognized address. There is considerable variation among individual respondents in which logic to follow or in the interpretation of different situations, but these differences cannot be identified with any ethnic group.

It is interesting to speculate on the reasons for this similarity in the face of the very real socioeconomic disparities and differences in actual living situations between our respondents. Respondents' ideas about residence are essentially cultural and linguistic forms, and as such do not primarily derive from or directly represent their own experiences. That is to say, even the tenuously housed judge most situations in terms of permanent residence, and members of groups with special household structures offered us no special terms to describe them. These similarities may derive from exposure to common models of how residence "properly" occurs. Or, we may speculate, the connotations which are implicit in the language used to express residence may guide respondents' judgments, and this language is essentially shared by all of the groups which speak English. Two of our interviewers noted the tendency of respondents to comment frequently on what they thought the characters in the vignettes <u>should</u> be doing, even when they were clearly represented as doing something else. This indicates that many responses were governed by normative interpretations residence. This tendency to normative response may be carried out in the creation of rosters. It suggests that anomalous or confusing residence situations may be cognitively altered by respondents to fit the cultural models of residence they already possess.

The similarity between the groups is significant in another way. The middle class white group, which we had expected to share the most with the writers of census questions, is not distinguished in this way. This leads us to believe

that milieu which produces census questions is an institutional culture which is not identical with that of any particular group, and is potentially misunderstood by all of them.

However, some differences between groups occur in our findings. These differences are presented below.

1. There may be differences in the frequencies with which the word stay is used in different groups. It appears that African American respondents may use stay relatively more often than middle class Whites. A few White respondents did not use the term "stay" at all during our interviews, or mentioned it only once or twice. For two White respondents, "stay" had a restricted meaning of being somewhere for a short period of time for work. The situations we presented to them were not close enough to this to elicit the term. "Stay" seems to be more commonly used among African American respondents than among Whites. Some African American respondents in this study will say that "live" and "stay" mean the same thing, although in other contexts the two words are used as distinct by the same respondents. (Other research has indicated that there are regional, rather than racial differences in the judgment of similarity and difference between the two words.) In general, the associations of "live" and "stay" with permanence and temporariness are similar in all groups.

2. Hispanic respondents evaluated co-residence arrangements between unrelated persons much more positively than did members of the other groups. They tended to see them as cooperating and getting along "like family" even if they were not bound together by economic necessity. However, like other respondents, Hispanic respondents tended to see unrelated persons as being members of different households.

3. White respondents seemed to be relatively less familiar with the kinds of situations which we had collected from the ethnographic reports than were the other groups. The African American and Hispanic respondents sometimes commented on people they knew or knew of who were in the living situations which were portrayed in the vignettes. This did not occur with the White respondents.

PART V. SPANISH LANGUAGE RESULTS

The interview protocol was translated into Spanish, and six interviews were carried out with monolingual speakers of that language. The following section presents the results of those interviews. It was not possible to perform detailed linguistic analysis of the questionnaires to discover the use contexts of all the major residence terminology. However, we have attempted to look at a range of alternative words which are used by respondents and translated as "live" and "stay", and to ascertain the meanings assigned to several important Spanish residence terms which occur on the census form. We have relied to a great extent on the intuitions of our translator/interviewer, Lourdes Hartman, in this analysis. The following conclusions should be regarded as tentative, and as nothing more than suggestive of further research.

A. The translation of the vignettes

Some of the vignettes could not be translated exactly, or altered meaning when they are rendered into Spanish. For example, one vignette, about men who had recently been in prison, refers to "parole officers." This institution does not exist in Latin America. It was decided to replace "parole officer" with the term "social worker" instead. Presumably, "social workers" are less authoritative than "parole officers". This may have affected the respondents' reasoning about "legal address" in this vignette.

One translation related change had significant effects on several of the vignettes. We rendered "house" as "casa", but although this is the closest Spanish alternative to the English term, the two concepts have different ranges of meaning. "House" denotes a physical structure, and English language respondents sometimes stress this by repeating truism that "A house is not a home." However, the word "casa" connotes both the physical structure and a social unit which it contains. Alternative English translations for "casa" might be "home" or "household." We had employed the word "house" in the vignettes as being relatively residence-neutral. However, "casa" shifts the meaning of many vignettes because it may imply belonging to a social unit rather than mere presence in a physical location. This may affect the likelihood of a character being residentially assigned there. In all, six of our vignettes make reference to someone's "house". In Spanish, therefore, the vignettes may have less neutral and more social descriptions of where people live.

B. Live and Stay in Spanish

The Spanish translation of "live", which is used in the roster question of the 1990 decennial census is "vivir", and the verb "quedar" is used to translate the English "stay."

Respondents frequently use the term "vivir", but a variety of modified and unmodified alternatives are used as well. When these respondents wanted to indicate a high degree of permanency, adjective modifiers were added to the term. We noted the modifiers "actualmente" (actually) and "realmente" (really), which served to distinguish stable, long term living conditions when added to the verb. One very common form of "vivir" was noted in the Spanish language interviews, and might be worth further investigation. This is the form "convivir", which means "to live together with", and according to our interviewer, it implies a degree of harmony. Respondents appear to use this to stress the social connectedness of persons who live together. These respondents were extremely sensitive to kin ties, but "convivir" is used to indicate living together with unrelated persons, as in the phrase "convivencia con otros extranos", (living together with strangers.)

Two other verbs were occasionally used to indicate "live". These were "residir" and "habitar." "Habitar" was used by respondents to stress the physical and non-social aspects of living somewhere. For example, it came up in a conversation in which the respondent was trying to explain the word "casa" in its sense as a shelter. In that context, "a house is, actually, the place where you live" (una parte donde uno habita.) In the interviewer's

opinion, its use in this context was informal, to stress the non-social connotation of "casa". Another respondent used the verb "habitar" to describe the situation of an orphan living without parents or other relatives, again, non-socially. The verb "residir" was only used once or twice by respondents, and we can do no more than note its occurrence.

The term "quedar" did not occur very commonly in these interviews; in fact it appears that the interviewer used it more than did the respondents. It has the same potential as the English word "stay" to cover a wide range of permanency. Especially when it is combined with "dormir", (to sleep) it carries the connotation of a very temporary stay. "Quedarse dormir" seems to be more or less equivalent to the English "overnight stay." However, "quedar" can shift in its connotations depending on the context. The following passage shows how "quedar" can be used to indicate permanence:

> "...she visits her sisters, O.K., but she is only visiting, she doesn't stay there (no se queda aqui). I think that in her house she stays there and she lives there (se queda y alli vive).

This use of "quedar" looks very similar to what has been previously described as the root meaning of stay.

Several other ways of indicating connections to places were identified. The verb "pasar" (to pass) can be used in context to render meanings similar to "stay." For example, one respondent described a long visit by using the phrase "I want to stay with you visiting at your house". The sense of "stay" in this is rendered by a form of "pasar": "quiero pasarla contigo alli de visita en tu casa." The form "estar con" (to be with) is used very frequently by all respondents in these interviews. It seems to take on implications of both temporariness and permanence, depending on the context of the sentence. Children living with their mothers can be described in this way; however, the most common way of describing being homeless also uses the verb "estar": "no tiene donde estar" (have no place to stay/be).

C. Casa and hogar

We were also interested in examining the ranges of meaning of the words "casa" and "hogar", which are used in the wording of the 1990 Spanish language census form. The term "hogar" has strong emotional connotations to people, and generally signals the presence of family. The following passage appears to be typical:

> A. We understand home (hogar) to be where you are together with all your family. Your children, your wife, that is your home.
> Q. The family?
> A. The complete family, yes.

The exact phrase, "complete family" was repeated by another respondent. Nuclear family members were always mentioned, but others indicated that other relatives, such as cousins, brothers or brothers-in-law might be part of an "hogar". The term is very similar to the English term home in that it has important emotional connotations. Respondents talked about being cared for,

experiencing moral support, and a feeling of unity or harmony within a "hogar." This was given abstract expression by one respondent who spoke about "la vida hogarena", which was translated for us as "family-oriented life." It appears that the term "hogar" taps directly into a set of ideals about family life.

When it is contrasted with "hogar", casa tends to refer more to the physical structure than to the social unit:

> A. House (casa) is where you live. You have a roof, everything, where you keep your things. Now a home (hogar) is a family, is to live together with a family. To have a mother, a father, your children, and so on.

However, it appears that in certain usages, "casa" does indicate an essentially social unit. For example, attached to someone's name or kin title, as in "casa de la madre", (mother's house), "casa" seems to connote a group of people rather than a physical structure. Respondents placed the highly mobile young girl in one of our vignettes in the "casa de la madre" on these grounds. The phrases "miembro de la casa" and "parte de la casa" also indicate this social connotation of the term. Clearly, one can only be a "member" or "part" of a house in its metaphorical social sense. People were frequently assigned as "members of the house" on the basis of the closeness of kin ties. Husbands and wives were placed together, and we were also told:

> "...the Latin American family is closer, especially the Latin American mothers are closer to her children. Even when they are already married, to them [the mothers] they [the children] will always be part of them."

This is very similar to what some of our English language respondents told us about the word "household".

D. Usual residence in Spanish

We were also interested in the term "residencia habitual", which is used in the 1990 Spanish language census form to indicate "usual residence". The term does not occur naturally in these interviews, and was always introduced in our probes. The term is sometimes modified by respondents, just as English language respondents do in order to render the form more familiar. "Habitual" is sometimes dropped. The term "residencia" by itself is similar in meaning to "casa", in that it refers primarily to a physical structure, as casa sometimes does. However, by itself it appears to carry social connotations of permanence:

> Q. And just residence alone?
> A. Where one is permanent.

For at least one respondent, the term carried connotations of ownership: one could rent or sell a "residencia." According to our interviewer, "residencia" is a word which might be used to describe "big houses" in a middle class area.

In other instances, "habitual" is replaced by other modifiers. We found "residencia normal" (normal residence) and "residencia actual" (actual residence.) It appears that both of these forms, as well as the term "residencia habitual" carry connotations of considerable permanence:

Q. What do you understand by usual residence? (residencia habitual)
A. Usual residence is when he is permanently there.
Q. Is it the permanency?
A. It is the permanency that gives me the assurance that he's usually there (esta habitualmente alli), all the time, he's always living there.

It seems that all of the forms of usual residence, both modified and unmodified, carry connotations of permanence. There is no suggestion, as there is in English, that the census based term might be referring to the less stable of two places. However, the degree of permanence these Spanish speaking respondents read into the term may not match census intentions either.

E. Other residence judgments

We were surprised at the degree of similarity we found between the residence judgments of Spanish and English speakers. We identified several of the patterns discussed above in the Spanish language interviews:

a. Where a person gets mail and the official addresses they give are sometimes regarded as critical information in judging residence.

b. The residence of children is dependent on who is perceived as having custody of them.

c. College students are seen as living with their parents and belonging to their households.

d. Live-in employees are seen as properly being counted in the census with their families.

However, some differences can be suggested. Family ties are a strong influence on these responses. In the vignette in which a man is portrayed as having ties to both his wife and his mother, it appears that the marriage tie is the most powerful. This is perhaps not surprising considering the ideal nuclear unit which is envisaged in connection with the term "hogar". The character is primarily assigned to the place where he can be seen as belonging to a "hogar."

The concept of family is sometimes extended to cover non-kin. In this, the Spanish speaking respondents seem to be quite different from respondents in the other groups. This could be clearly seen in a vignette which describes a couple who rent rooms to a cousin, his friends, and a couple from the country

they all come from. Where many of the English language respondents had exclusive definitions of "household" which extended only to the couple who rented the apartment, most of the Spanish speaking respondents tended to include everybody who was there.

One respondent described this as being members of the household "in a family sense--they are amongst family."

This extension of kinship and household membership to non-related persons is often based on sharing. Most of the Spanish speaking respondents presume that the co-members of this crowded household share with one another and get along well:

> "I am sure that they share everything. Because the majority of people here do it that way since they know that it's difficult, or they are out of work, or they are in great need, they go as far as to share things with friends, even if they haven't known them a long time."

As a result, they evaluate the situation much more positively than did our other respondents, who tended to react to the situation in terms of overcrowding and conflict. In one instance, the non-kin people were seen as members of the group based on the existence of common national ties:

> Q. ...Would you say that they live as family?
> A. I think so. Precisely because they come from the same country--well it is very different when you rent to a 'paisano'...That's the way I see it...That's why I said they were all part of the same household."

These respondents were familiar with this form of cooperative nationality based combined household. However, there does not appear to be a separate term by which it is called:

> "To share expenses and not spend too much. But, what is the name, how would we call that group, I have no idea."

F. Difficulties with the Census Form

As part of the interview, the respondents were given the roster page of a 1990 Spanish language census form to fill out. Two difficulties were worth noting:

One respondent had difficulty with the concept of the include/do not include lists. Apparently he thought that he was supposed to find someone in the include categories to list, and complained that he had no one in his family in the Army. Then he asked if he was supposed to list only his own family. This may indicate that the lists themselves are confusing for some respondents.

Another respondent did not recognize the word "pupilos" which is used on the form to indicate boarders. The interviewer provided a long explanation, after which the respondent thought that the term applied only to school children

renting rooms. The interviewer believed that none of the respondents would have understood the term, and that the others had in all likelihood not seen it.

PART VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Cognitive Study of Living Situations is an investigation of the terms and concepts used by respondents in thinking about residence. It has allowed us to identify areas of potential misunderstanding arising from the language used on the decennial questionnaire. Among the most important linguistic findings are the following:

1. The terms "live" and "stay" are often modified and used in highly contextual ways. Even for those who generally find them different in meaning, contexts exist in which they are the same, or reverse in meaning.

RECOMMENDATION:

The terms "live" and "stay" should not be used alone to indicate the meanings of permanent and temporary affiliations to places. These meanings should be reinforced by the naturally used modifiers "permanent" and "temporary". This will serve to counteract contextual shifts in meaning for respondents, and will also serve to remind them of the entire range of affiliations that we want them to keep in mind.

2. The term "usual residence" is not naturally used and is found confusing by many respondents.

RECOMMENDATION:

"Usual residence" should be regarded as an in-house bureaucratic concept which is not appropriate to use in communicating with respondents. It should be eliminated from decennial questionnaires.

3. The term "household" is differently defined by respondents and by the Census Bureau. For respondents, it indicates a social unit defined by kinship and social cooperation. Individuals may be included in a household on the basis of kinship, even if they are not present, and unrelated persons may be excluded even if they are. As a result, the term household may be misleading in roster questions and instructions.

RECOMMENDATION:

The term "household" should be eliminated from questions and instructions on the decennial questionnaire.

4. The terms "home" and "permanent residence" are inappropriate for use in census questionnaires, because they do not necessarily imply that the person is currently living in the place.

RECOMMENDATION:

These terms should not be used in census questionnaires.

5. In responding to the meaning of census questions, respondents may implicitly compare census based terms and concepts with what they find familiar or expect to hear. For example, this occurs when respondents interpret "usual residence" by replacing it, or comparing it with the more common, naturally occurring "permanent residence." The natural language contexts of the terms "live" and "stay" also potentially affect the frame of reference that respondents bring to their understanding of census questions that use those terms.

RECOMMENDATION:

The evaluation of questionnaires should include an investigation of natural language contexts related to the wording of the questionnaire.

6. Many respondents believe that there is a legal aspect to residence. In part, this is based on their experience with other social institutions, for which a consistent legal or permanent address is required. Some respondents assume that our questions are about the same concept of residence taught to them by their experiences with these institutions.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Census Bureau should consider means of differentiating its concepts and aims from those of other social institutions.

7. The concepts which respondents employ in understanding residence are in many ways different from the concepts the census bureau intends them to use. In general, respondents are interested in long-term, stable social affiliations to places, and are less concerned with an assessment of where people are actually located. Census enumeration rules follow a mixed strategy. In some instances (like rules for enumerating newborn babies, persons temporarily away on business trips or in general hospitals), social affiliation is paramount. In other instances, (like the rules for enumerating college students, live-in employees, or persons away during the week working,) a logic of location is followed. The lists of rules to which respondents are currently exposed include items that follow both social and locational principles. Enumeration rules based primarily on location are consistent with the "usual residence" concept, but respondents find them counter-intuitive. That is to say, they naturally place college students, live-in employees, those away during the week working, children, and even tenuously attached individuals if there is a socially appropriate "home" in which to put them, in the social units where they are thought to belong.

In light of this, it might be wise to reevaluate the problem of "communicating the rules" to census respondents. Our respondents do not merely lack information about what we want them to do. Rather, in many instances, they have a clear tendency (which is in some ways more consistent than our rules)

to do something else. This suggests that getting respondents to read the rules will not be enough to ensure compliance with them. Even if respondents are aware of what we require, they may find it illogical or wrong, and choose to ignore it. Correcting this may prove to be a difficult task, which certainly will require strategies beyond a simple listing of the rules. In some instances, it may be easier to change a rule than to find efficient ways of getting respondents to follow it.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Census Bureau should consider re-examining the current enumeration rules to see where it is possible to bring them closer to respondents' natural concepts.

Further research will be necessary to find better ways of communicating remaining counter-intuitive rules to respondents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

de la Puente, Manuel
1993. "Why Are People Missed or Erroneously Included by the Census: A Summary of Findings From Ethnographic Coverage Reports." Proceedings of the 1993 Research Conference on Undercounted Ethnic Populations, May 5-7, Richmond, VA.

Gerber, Eleanor R.
1993. "Understanding Residence Questions: The Meaning of Census Terms to Respondents". Paper presented to the American Statistical Association, August 1992.
1990. "Calculating Residence: A Cognitive Approach to Household Membership Among Low Income Blacks. Research report prepared for the Center for Survey Methods Research, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Gerber, Eleanor R. and Nancy Bates,
1994. "Respondents' Understanding of Residence Terminology in Cognitive Research and in the Living Situation Survey". Paper presented at the Bureau of the Census Annual Research Conference, March 22, 1994

Kissam, Edward, Enrique Hererra and Jorge M. Nakamoto
1993. "Hispanic Response to Census Enumeration Forms and Procedures". Report by Aguirre, International submitted to the Center for Survey Methods Research, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Research Triangle Institute
December, 1992. "Living Situation Survey Report on Questionnaire Pretest Activities." Report submitted to the Center for Survey Methods Research, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

FREE ELICITATION
KEY WORD: LIVE

2. Joan and Tommy's parents are separated. Their father has a room for them at his apartment, and they are listed on his lease. They spend 2 nights a week there, and 6 weeks during the summer. The rest of the time they spend at their mother's.

Residence rules involved: usual home elsewhere, family member living here
MOBILITY, MULTIPLE ATTACHMENT
Probes: What would you call the time Joan and Tommy spend with their father?
What would you call the time Joan and Tommy spend with their mother?
Where do they live?

3. Every spring, Bob leaves his house in the country to work construction jobs in the city about 100 miles away. He generally finds work from April to October. Sometimes he camps in a state park near the city. Sometimes he sleeps in a shelter, or stays with friends.

Residence rules involved: temporarily away on a business trip, no usual home elsewhere, where spends the greater part of the year.
MOBILITY
Probes: What would you call the time Bob spends in the city?
What would you call the time Bob spends in the country?
Where does Bob live?

4. Lola comes from a big family. For the last few years, she has travelled between one sister's place and another. Sometimes she is there a week, sometimes months. But no matter how long she spends at her sisters' places, eventually she goes back to her mother's house.

Residence rules involved: visiting temporarily, family member living here
MULTIPLE ATTACHMENTS, MOBILITY
Probes: What would you call the time Lola spends at her sisters'?
What would you call the time Lola spends at her mother's?
Where does Lola live?

INTRODUCE CENSUS TERMS:
KEY WORD: HOUSEHOLD

5. Dennis is Mary's son. He gets almost all his mail, including automobile registration and his check from work, at Mary's house. Only the utility bill goes to his wife's apartment. He keeps his clothes and other things in both apartments. Mary does all his laundry.

Residence rules involved: family member living here, usual home elsewhere
MULTIPLE ATTACHMENTS
Probes: Where does Dennis usually live?
Is Dennis a member of his mother's household?
Is Dennis a member of his wife's household?

6. Lillian and Bobby have a son. Bobby comes to her apartment at least twice a week with food and diapers for the baby. He gives Lillian money when he can. Often he spends the night there after seeing his son. Lillian does not really know where he is at other times, but she knows he has at least one other child.

Residence rules involved: family member living here, usual home elsewhere
TENUOUS ATTACHMENTS, MOBILITY
Probes: Is Bobby a member of Lillian's household?
How would you describe Bobby's living situation?

7. Ilona and her husband rent a three bedroom apartment. They and their children sleep in one bedroom and the dining room. To make ends meet, they have rented one bedroom to a cousin and 2 of his friends. The other bedroom is rented by a couple from the country where Ilona was born. They all share the kitchen, but each bedroom has a separate refrigerator.

Residence rules involved: family member living here, roommate, housemate
COMPLEX HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE
Probes: Who is in Ilona's household?
How would you describe the living situation of the couple?
How would you describe the living situation of Ilona's cousin?
What would you call the group of people at Ilona's?

8. Loretta always has managed to find an apartment near an adult son and daughter, who have places of their own. They all frequently eat at Loretta's. Her daughter's children usually sleep at Loretta's apartment.

COMPLEX HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE
Probes: Who is in Loretta's household?
Where do Loretta's grandchildren live?
What would you call the group of people who eat at Loretta's?

INTRODUCE CENSUS TERMS
KEY WORD: RESIDENCE

9. When Doris decided her street was unsafe, she sent her 12 year old son to his grandmother's house several blocks away. He goes to school in his grandmother's neighborhood, and sleeps there most nights. But he frequently eats at his mother's. His mother provides money for support.

Residence rules involved: family member living here, family member temporarily away
MULTIPLE ATTACHMENTS
Probes: Where does Doris' son live?
Is Doris' son a member of his grandmother's household?
Where is the son's usual residence?

10. Lottie's grandfather is very old. Last year, he became ill, and spent a total of 6 months in a nursing home, in three different admissions. He is in the nursing home now, but Lottie plans to have him come to her house as soon as he is physically able.

Residence rules involved: family member living here, long term care facility
MULTIPLE ATTACHMENTS, GROUP QUARTERS
Probes: Where does Lottie's grandfather live?
Where is Lottie's grandfather's usual residence?
Is Lottie's grandfather part of her household?

11. Antonia's nephew and son have spent most of their adult lives in prison. When they were released, they gave her address to their parole officers. Most days, they can be found at her house until about 10 p.m., but then they are gone over night. Antonia says she doesn't know where they go when they are not there.

Residence rules involved: family member living here, usual place elsewhere
MULTIPLE ATTACHMENTS, GROUP QUARTERS
Probes: Where do Antonia's son and nephew live?
Where is their usual residence?
Are the son and nephew part of Antonia's household?

INTRODUCE CENSUS FORM

Now I would like you to look at this census form. Please fill out Question 1 as though you had received it in the mail at the place where you live. Full names are optional. You can use a first name, a nickname, or some other means of identification, if you prefer. [When finished]:

Would you tell me in your own words what this question is asking?
How are these people related to you?
How did you decide to list these people?
Was there anyone you were uncertain of listing? Why?

Now I'd like to ask you about your responses to a few more situations like the ones we discussed before.

12. Alberta is a housekeeper who sleeps at her employers' place from Monday to Friday. She sees her husband and children on Saturday and Sunday.

Residence rules involved: live-in employee, lives someplace else most of the week while working
MULTIPLE ATTACHMENTS, AWAY FOR WORK
Probes: Where should Alberta be counted in the census?
Why do you think so?
Where does Alberta live?
Is Alberta a member of her employer's household?

13. Steve is in college and has a room in the dormitory. Most of his things are at his parent's house, and the college sends his grades to their address. He spends vacations and the summer at his parents house.

Residence rules involved: College student, family member living here
MULTIPLE ATTACHMENTS, AWAY FOR COLLEGE
Probes: Where should Steve be counted in the census?
Why do you think so?
Where does Steve live?
Where is Steve's usual residence?
Is Steve a member of his parents' household?

CARD SORT TASK

Now I'd like your help with something else. These cards describe some ordinary daily activities.

Present cards and allow respondent to read through them. (If the respondent cannot read, allow them to refuse the task.)

Eat there most of the time
Sleep there most of the time
Have your own room or space
Feel free to invite visitors at any time
Help with chores such as cleaning house or watching children
Have you name on the lease or mortgage
Have a say in making house rules
Receive mail, phone calls or messages
Have a key and the right to come and go at any time
Contribute money for rent, food or bills
Keep furniture, T.V. or other large belongings there
Keep personal belongings such as clothing or jewelry there
Have children of your own who stay there

Please sort through the cards and tell me which daily activities go with "Member of the household"

Please sort through the cards and tell me which daily activities go with "Usual residence."

IF TIME ALLOWS, PRESENT THE FOLLOWING:
Please sort through the cards and tell me which daily activities go with "Home."
Now I have just a few more questions.

Please tell me how old you are?
Where were you born?
(If foreign born) How did you learn English?
Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin?
What race do you consider yourself to be?
Gender by observation.
Are you currently employed? Full or part time?
Do you rent or own the place you are currently living in?
How many years of school have you completed?

That's all of the questions I have today. Thank you very much for helping me.