THE BICENTENNIAL CENSUS IN A MIXED NEIGHBORHOOD IN CHICAGO

by
Terry Anne Straus

INTRODUCTION

The original focus of this work was on the American Indian population of Chicago. Chicago became a center of Indian population shortly after the Second World War. Wartime employment opportunities and subsequent federal relocation programs for American Indians brought thousands of Indian people from reservations into the city. The Chicago American Indian Center was established in 1952 to assist Indian people in finding work, housing, and social support in the city.

In the past, Indian people in Chicago have been aware of a significant undercount of Indian population in the census. Specifically, the various Indian community organizations had on their client rolls more Indian people than were counted by the Census. In 1984, Native American Educational Services (NAES) College, a private, Indian-owned community-based college in Chicago, published an analysis of the 1980 Census figures for American Indians in Chicago, which included some discussion of possible reasons for the undercount. In co-sponsoring the current research, the college hoped to test and elaborate upon some of hypotheses suggested in the 1984 study.

A site was selected for the Alternative Enumeration which was generally recognized to include as high a percentage of Indian population as would be found anywhere in a single sub sample in the city. It was located within the census tracts identified in the 1984 study as having the highest concentration of Indian people, and it included a large, 52 unit building identified by long term residents as an "Indian building." The same statements about the AE sample area could be made today, almost a year after the AE. Yet only 9% of the number of individuals counted in the AE were American Indians.

FIELD METHODS

Three individuals were involved in the ethnographic study. The principal investigator, Dr. Terry Straus, is currently Dean of the Chicago Campus of Native American Educational Services College which co-sponsored the research. Kermit Valentino, who served as research assistant, is an Oneida Indian, currently a student at the college, president of the Indian parents' association, and board member of the American Indian Center. The site was selected with Kermit's advice, based on a general consensus of Indian people questioned concerning concentration of Indian population, and on the fact that he had relatives and friends resident within the site, and that he knew people who lived in the boarded up building and in cars adjacent to the site.

As the ethnographic research commenced it became clear that we needed help in working with the Cambodian population which represented the largest ethnic group in the site. Phalla Sakun was hired to work among the Cambodians living in the site. She is a very bright teenager whose English is good and whose first language is Cambodian. She was familiar with the census and interested in helping develop an accurate enumeration of Cambodians in the ethnographic study. She once lived in the building here described as the "Cambodian building" and knew personally most of the residents in the building.

Phalla worked only in the Cambodian building. Kermit and/or Terry worked in all the other housing units in the site. One or the other of them was in the site virtually every day during the 6 weeks of the study. We also managed to visit at different times of the day so as to recognize the best times for visiting and talking with people. It was clear that the best times of day for us were late in the afternoon, early in the evening and during the day on weekends. In the good weather, people were outside their homes at these times, children playing games and older residents watching and visiting. This meant that household-housing unit links were more difficult to discern, but it also meant that communication with residents was easier and less threatening to them. After dark, the residents tended to be inside watching t.v., preparing for bed and avoiding trouble in what is clearly a dangerous area. After dark is a poor time to do census work. It is a good time to find people home, but they are understandably unlikely to open their doors to a stranger.

Kermit's acquaintance with the manager of the "Indian building" and Phalla's association with the "Cambodian building" earned us at least tolerant acceptance in the community. People became used to seeing us and thus less concerned about us. In each of the smaller buildings, we tried to become friendly or at least positively associated with one or more residents: in the larger buildings, several residents. One evening, early in the project, we mapped the interior of the "Indian building" and our presence caused a considerable disturbance: we were escorted out. This event later was the cause of amusement and in fact served as a kind of ice-breaker.

We made use of administrative records, especially voters' registration, plat maps and aerial superposition maps in the course of our fieldwork. In the case of voters' registration, we learned to our surprise that several voters were registered out of a large burned out/boarded up building. Otherwise, the voters' registration was unenlightening beyond making clear the political interests of building managers (that is, the ones interested in local politics made sure that people in their buildings were registered to vote). Chicago no longer has a reverse telephone-address listing: it probably would have been helpful in finding the names of certain ambiguous residents. However, many of the residents in the site did not have phones and so would not be cross-referenced anyway.

City real estate records proved the most important source of administrative records for our purposes. Title information on the burned and abandoned building allowed us to determine the number of units and to learn its social history. The building could not be entered for mapping: it was boarded and guard dogs had been used.

Fieldwork proper was observation and interview. It was not really what anthropologists call participant observation: the time period was too short and the nature of the study too directed to make real participant observation feasible or practical. Field notes from the longest days of fieldwork contain tremendous numbers of visual observations on residents, much in the manner of those cited by Rynearson (1989). For example:

> -"Cambodian grandfather walking an infant around in front of building. Infant probably under 4 months: predicted miss."
>
> -"Watched two residents, older white males, examine the items they had salvaged from garbage cans and alleys and transported to the site in a stolen grocery cart. They were absorbed in detaching a fan from a discarded air conditioner."
>
> -"The brown car is still parked in the alley. No evidence of residents, however, during the three hours I watched the site today."

Throughout the study, we were observers, informed by previous knowledge of the American Indian and Cambodian people in Chicago, not by participation in the particular ethnographic site. We were certainly welcomed into many homes and on a smiling if not sociable basis with many residents by the end of the study; but we did not participate in community events other than the usual Indian community activities in which we would always participate or in Phalla's case, the usual Cambodian activities in which she would always participate; we did not live in the site; we did not find employment in the site. We were careful observers, but not valid participants.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITE

Housing Stock

Housing stock in the ethnographic site is typical of the surrounding neighborhood. There is a variety of kinds of housing units in varying states of repair. It includes expensive, renovated apartments and a low rent building now abandoned after a fire; it includes a large single family home next to a crowded low rent building; it includes single person residency units and units with large families. Both building and decay are occurring at the same time. Today, the abandoned building is being rebuilt and renovation of another building is nearing completion, yet the two largest buildings in the site continue to decline. Immediately across the alley from the site is a low-rise public housing development criticized by the more vocal long-term residents of the site.

Gentrification is occurring throughout the area, but very slowly, indeed more slowly than the developers had anticipated, so that there are renovated apartments in the ethnographic site and throughout the neighborhood which have stood empty for a considerable time. With the exception of 2 units out of 201, all units are rental units: that is, 99% of the units in the sample area are rental units. Of those units, only 3 occupied units, or 1.5% are high-rent units, and each of these is shared by several room-mates.

This is a dangerous area. Gang graffiti line the garage doors and back walls of the buildings along the alley. Building managers speak of local crack houses and gang threats. Security devices and procedures are obvious: the single family residence is surrounded by a foreboding iron gate and guarded by menacing Dobermans; audio and video devices guard the one high rent building and signs announce the procedure for visiting in the "Indian" building.

Perhaps more than any other physical indications of mobility and poverty in the area is the immediate presence of a daily pay operation, its buses parked within clear view of the site. Within the Indian community, daily pay operations are both signs of and accessories to poverty and run-down neighborhoods. Indian people first coming into Chicago in the 1950's and those living on Skid Row commonly were clients of such operations. They found that the more they worked, the further behind they got. The daily pay check (in the past, sometimes scrip, not even a check) would be cashed at the neighboring bar, owned by a colleague of the daily pay management. It would, of course, be spent there as well, or at the flop house recommended by management as one which would accept the check. The worker commonly ended up in debt and thus had to continue working. A major paper on this process will be available at NAES College in July, written by Ed Goodvoice, an American Indian alcoholism counselor who writes about Skid Row as he lived it 25 years ago.

Just beyond the ethnographic site is a complex best described as a large commune. It includes an apartment building and what was once a single family home, with a paved playground area between them. Its population is ethnically mixed, but predominantly white and overwhelmingly young. Old cars, buses and pick-ups are parked in front and in back of the building. Residents congregate outside the building, talking and often drinking beer, standing on the sidewalk outside the building. Residents work in the communal painting and decorating enterprise. There is continual turnover of residents and reworking of the building to suit the changing needs.

Neighboring the ethnographic site to the east is a large and decrepit apartment building with a laundrymat and store on the first floor, inhabited predominantly by young people, many of whom are apparently unemployed. Even in bad weather, but most noticeably in the spring (including Census Day and the period of the AE), residents and others hang around the outside of the building drinking, sitting in or on cars parked outside the building.

In the ethnographic site and surrounding neighborhood, it is difficult to predict the number of housing units within a large building from any exterior features of the building. In neither of the two large structures in the site itself were there outside mailboxes or electric meters. In one case, there were doorbells, but they did not correspond to the housing units and were scantily labeled; in the other building, there were no outside doorbells.

There is a high rate of vacancy (in the site, of 199 units, 101 or 51% were vacant). Ninety of those units are contained within the burned out and abandoned building in the middle of the block. These units are currently being rehabilitated by a developer and the building should be returned to function within the next year. Like the units which preceded them, these are mostly one or two person units. Unlike the units which preceded them, the new ones will have kitchen and bathroom facilities in each unit. Indeed, now that work is in progress in the burned out building, the building is no longer secured against squatters and may again include them as it is summer and at least the Indian people in this neighborhood seem to hang out in unusual residences more in the summer than during the colder months of the year.

Within occupied buildings and both into and out of the site, there is a high rate of mobility. Between Census Day and the Alternative Enumeration, in the building with 28 units, residency changes occurred in four units, in the building with 52 units, 12 changes in residency occurred. In these two large buildings, then, changes in residency occurred in about 20% of the units in the four month period following Census Day. Indeed, changes occurred between the time of Mail Returns (March, April 1990) and the enumerators' returns, accounting for some confusion in the censusing of these buildings.

The housing stock in the area changes continually, housing units (and other, less conventional living quarters) appearing and disappearing. Three kinds of change occurred during the period of this study. At the time of site selection, the large "abandoned," burned-out building, was inhabited by squatters, most or perhaps all of whom were American Indians. By the time of the AE, the building had been rendered uninhabitable by the use of boards and guard dogs. Other living quarters, if not housing units, that disappeared included cars parked in the alley behind the buildings censused. Recently, the parked car/living quarters have completely disappeared from the ethnographic site, perhaps under pressure of new "yuppie" residents, perhaps because of improved opportunity for the former occupants.

A final kind of loss of housing units typical of the ethnographic site is loss due to rehabilitation and reconstruction: walls are removed to make larger units from smaller ones in apartment houses, and in the case of the one single family home in the site, at least four units had been converted into the single family residence. Both kinds of change are typical of the neighborhood within which the ethnographic site is located. Abandonment and gentrification account for changes in and difficulty accounting for all housing units.

It is not surprising, then, that much of the undercount in the ethnographic site is due to missed housing units.[1] Mobility, vacancy, and unusual residences were predicted at the site and all contribute to the likelihood of undercount.

---

[1] After resolution, it was determined that eight per cent of all valid housing units and six per cent of all valid occupied housing units in this sub sample of one Chicago block were omitted in the census from addresses within the site (LAB).

People

Racially and ethnically, the neighborhood is mixed. Economically, it is predominantly low-income. Percentages of population in the ethnographic site have been calculated as follows:

Table 1. Differences in reporting race to the 1990 Census and to the Alternative Enumeration

Race reported	AE	Census
Asian	43.8%	19.4%
White	28.1	28.1
American Indian	9.4	4. 6
Black	8.1	14.8
Other race	6.8	20.9
Missing	3.8	12.2

Source: Unresolved "after-match" STR site data statistics by Jeanette Robinson, CSMR, February 1991.

Some of the differences in race in the census figures here can be attributed to 7 out-of-scope units included in the census file that was matched to the Alternative Enumeration. These units were not in the sub sample area so their 16 total residents, all of whom were censused as Black, should be excluded. While this accounts for the difference in percentage of Blacks, the Asian, American Indian and the "Other race" categories remain of interest and will be discussed separately below.

In the good weather, there is a constant, vibrant stream of activity on the street and sidewalks of the block, people visiting, working on cars, drinking beer, watching. Different ethnic groups live side-by-side in what might properly be called an integrated neighborhood, but there is little interaction between them. The Cambodians at one end of the block visit among each other commonly, recognize and know each other in spite of the high mobility. Older Cambodians squat in their characteristic manner on the sidewalks in front of buildings with Cambodian residents, again visiting, minding children, or simply watching, participating in the sense of connectedness and in the evening's activities. In the middle of the block, residents of the largest building in the site stand around outside of their own building: their orientation is away from the Cambodian building rather than towards it. The "yuppy" residents are never seen on the street. On the other end of the block, the few Black and Hispanic residents tend to use the back porches rather than the front for socializing and relaxing.

The American Indian people in the ethnographic site live primarily in two buildings, the "Indian Building" and a six- flat next door to it. The Indian population of the "Indian building" used to be considerably greater than it is today. It is also a mobile population. Like Indian people all over the country, on reservations and in urban centers, Indian people in Chicago live in small clusters, scattered throughout the area.

The dispersed and mobile nature of the American Indian population makes it especially difficult to census. Relevant to the high residential mobility of American Indians is the age curve of the population. The preponderance of American Indian people in the city and elsewhere is young (Marozas, 1984). The young and especially the young men tend to move often. The age distribution of the population thus exaggerates the residential mobility of the total population.

Young parents commonly live with their own parents, usually the young mother will live with her own mother. The father commonly moves back and forth, living with them for some time, and with his own parents or friends at other times. Unmarried men move regularly through a variety of residences, commonly moving to other Indian communities, reservation or urban, for months or years at a time. Young children are frequently moved from one household to another within the community, especially to grandparents and/or other older relatives: in summer, children are frequently sent "home" to grandparents or other relatives on reservations in order to renew their relationships with family and tribe. American Indian families are extended families which include several households and various housing units. Where family lives, there you also may live and/or claim to residence.

Nuclear family households move often as exemplified by the family of the Indian research assistant in this project, which moved three times during the current year and has lived in many different locations in the city over the past 10 years. Within the site itself, three Indian people moved in after Census Day and one moved out. Each case was typical. The in-movers were relatives who came to live for a period of time with a prior resident in a particular housing unit. In one unit (A 123), the in-mover (person 05) was granddaughter to the householder; in the other unit (A 183), the in-movers (persons 02, 03) were sons to the householder. The out-mover (B 08 -01) had health and personal problems and moved in with her brother's family.

Twelve American Indians are listed on the census file for the ethnographic site. The AE found that 20 were resident in the site on Census Day. All 8 of the "missing" Indians were males, all enumerated but not identified as Indian in the census records. Reasons for the non-identification vary. In the case of A12 183-01 and of A12 122-01 and -02, Indian identity was elicited by an Indian research assistant who articulated the importance of accurate census to Indian people. In this context, four individuals were identified as Indian (including two who were in-movers), whereas they were not so identified in the Census.

Reasons for this selective identification are various. Discrimination is the most obvious among these. Chicago is still a city where Indians are not even recognized as a minority. Indians cannot apply for status as "minority businesses" because they are not a recognized minority; they cannot attend the Board of Education Washburn Trade School with special minority support for the same reason. United Way has just granted a three year $90,000 grant to the American Indian Economic Development Association to address employment discrimination in city government. These are all reasons for sustaining an official identity other than Indian, however one may choose personally to identify.

Furthermore, an enumerator relying on physical appearance to assess racial category might well make errors in identifying American Indians. Of the 8 identified on the A file as Indian and matched with individuals on the B file, 5 were identified as white in the Census, 2 as Black and 1 man, who is an Eskimo, was identified by a census enumerator as Asian. The Census categories are appropriate as to physical appearance but not consistent with self-identification and/or identification by other American Indian people.

In the past, there has been considerable anxiety on the part of urban American Indian residents that the urban count not decrease or work against the reservation count. It is through their association with a tribe and reservation that Indian people are eligible for the rights and privileges associated with treaties and agreements. There is some resistence, then, to being counted as Indian in the city in that it might jeopardize the individual's access to tribal benefits. At the same time, it is to the benefit of the tribe to count greater rather than lesser numbers and awareness of this may further contribute to an individual's non-identification as Indian in the Census.

There are many reasons, then, for the 40% of the Indian population which was enumerated in the Census but not counted as Indian.

More surprising, it seems, is the high degree of discrepancy between the Census and the AE with regard to the Cambodian population, clear from the percentages listed above. The Cambodian population in the ethnographic site is entirely concentrated in one 28 unit building. The building has one Hispanic resident of ambiguous residence and one household of white residents whose residence antedates the Cambodian immigration. Across the street and in the next block south are other such buildings. Unlike the American Indian population, the Cambodians tend to live in large ethnic clusters, often reconstructing friendships and social relationships from Cambodia. Like the Indian population, however, the Cambodians appear to be highly mobile. There is a great deal of visiting relatives and friends in other states, especially in California, where many Cambodians live. These visits, unlike those white residents are more familiar with, will last for weeks or months, not just hours or days. They are most likely in the summer months, when school is out for the children: education is taken very seriously by those families in the immediate ethnographic site.

There is a strong sense of family among the Cambodian residents, which in at least one instance translated into an error on a Mail Return. The response for housing unit A 12 005 matched with B 12 284 is interesting here. Both the census enumerator and the AE counted 5 persons in this housing unit, all of whom were resident as of Census Day. The mail return, however, indicated 2 additional persons, 2 daughters of the primary householder, who belonged to the family and perhaps the household but were not resident as of Census Day or during the Alternative Enumeration.

The tendency towards unusual and ambiguous residence evident among American Indian men is not pronounced among young Cambodian men. Young men tend to remain with their parents until marriage. If they live elsewhere, it is likely to be close-by and with the family of a close friend. Sometimes, though much less often, two young unmarried men will become room-mates. Because they may be living with another family while identified with their own family, these young single men may be missed by the census; but they do not tend to move around as much as the Indian men and are unlikely to become squatters or reside in cars or other unusual residences.

Cambodians in the ethnographic sample and elsewhere in the city live in clusters in mixed neighborhoods and tend to be internally cohesive but the "community" is other Cambodians: relations between the different ethnic groups in this site, as in the St.

Louis site "are superficial at best, hostile at worst, and there is minimal sense of local community (Rynearson, 1989, 3). Illustrative of this is that the White building manager of the largest building in the site reported that the residents of the Cambodian building were Vietnamese. There is little knowledge of or concern about neighbors who are not part of the immediate ethnic cluster. The primary exception to this is the comraderie evident among single person households in the large building in the middle of the block.

Cambodians accounted for 43.8% of the AE population but only 13% of the households: their households tend to be large and flexible. The bulk of unmatched records between the A and B files in the Cambodian building were due to missed housing units, confused by the tendency of building residents to change apartments within the building to suit changing space needs or personal preferences. Of the 24 Cambodian and Cambodian-Chinese households, 2 (or 8.3%) were missed by the Census.

Missed households are not surprising in this building where units and mailboxes do not coincide, where the floor plans are not symmetrical, where fear of strangers and English literacy were probably the greatest reasons for census resistance. The Cambodian research assistant on this project continually emphasized that in the history of the building, there had been "a rape" by an unknown white stranger of a Cambodian resident, subsequent to which residents became ever more fearful and suspicious of strangers in the building and were even less likely to open their doors to an enumerator. The enumerator recalled by building residents was white.

In many ways even more interesting in the matching results, however, are the matched households. Typical of the census results for the ethnographic sample, but more pronounced in this building, is the situation where the actual number of people counted is very close to that confirmed by the alternative enumeration, but the racial classification shows considerable discrepancy.

In certain cases, such as B 792 (= B 826), mail responses may account for this. The limited English literacy and the resultant misunderstanding of the census forms may have led respondents to list themselves as Cambodian but not as Asian. In my own instructions, the definition of Asian required careful attention as a list of several Asian races was provided, but Cambodian was not among them. Perhaps if the ethnic category did not appear on the illustrative list, they presumed they were not to be included in the Asian category.

In other cases, however, race response was through an enumerator. The census enumerator in May listed most building residents as Cambodian, but in the racial category listed most of these as "Other race" instead of "Other API" (Asian/Pacific Islander). The two Lao residents of the building were also censused as "Other Race" instead of Asian. Of 114 Cambodians on the B file, only 48 or 42% were listed as Asian.

The failure of census returns to classify Cambodians in the ethnographic sample as Asian accounts for the bulk of the discrepancy between percentages of population in the racial breakdown of the site for the census and AE figures: missing housing units account for the remainder.

As a "mixed" site, the absence of Blacks is notable in the ethnographic sample. Most of the Blacks in the site lived in one building at the northernmost end of the block. Census enumerators did classify Blacks as Black and the AE and Census records are matches in this regard for this building. In the same building, however, are both Puerto Ricans and Guatemalans as well as African-Americans and these residents were inconsistently classified by race: of 13 residents in 3 households, 4 residents or 31% and 1 household or 33% were classified as "Other race" and the others' races were unclassified on the census.

It is clear that a major problem for minority undercount in this ethnographic site is improper or no racial classification. Most individuals were censused: there is a high rate of match between the AE and Census files. But a large proportion of individuals in particular ethnic categories (most notable Cambodian and American Indian) are not classified in the appropriate racial category.

SOURCES OF UNDERCOUNT : CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary sources of minority undercount in the Chicago ethnographic site are missed housing units and inaccurate or incomplete demographic data.

The problem of missed housing units appears to be typical of mixed, low-income, highly mobile neighborhoods in inner city locations (Aschenbrenner, 1989, 1991; Rynearson, 1988, 1989, 1990; Hamid 1991; Ammar 1991; Wingerd 1991). It is reasonable, then, to suggest that enumerators and outreach personnel in the next census be prepared to focus on the problem of identifying and enumerating all housing units. They need to be aware of the incongruity between housing units and mailboxes; they need to learn to expect the unexpected in terms of building plan; they need to be aware of the potential for unusual residences such as cars and of the likelihood of squatters in apparently abandoned buildings.

In my own orientation by staff from the Center for Survey Methods Research, this preparation was accomplished: I was made aware of the likelihood of unusual residences (the image of the tumbleweed still remains) and the need to be very careful about locating housing units within buildings. The mapping process supported that orientation. A similar orientation might be provided for census enumerators, with a special session for those enumerating inner-city locations with the characteristics of this site, namely poverty, high vacancy rate, boarded up buildings, high residential mobility and change (either abandonment or gentrification or, as in the Chicago site, both).

It is important that enumerators not rely on administrative records in such neighborhoods as change is so rapid and building managers usually so distant that the records tend not to reflect reality. The manager of the "Cambodian building" at the site was an Eastern European man who lived in the neighborhood but not in the building. He focused on maintenance and rent collection, knew few of the people in the building, and was not aware of long-term visitors or absences. In the "Indian building" on the other hand, where the building manager lived in the building and participated in the social life of the residents, the records were reliable and current and anticipated changes were even reported.

With particular regard to the Indian population of the site and immediately surrounding area, it is important to stress the likelihood of ambiguous and/or alternative residences especially for young, single men. These are the most likely individuals to be missed by the census. Those I expected to count in the AE were gone before the 6 weeks period began: they had been squatters in the boarded up building and residents of cars in the alley behind the site. Where they were on census day and where they are now is not clear: most likely they became temporary members of households of relatives or friends. Some probably moved to the large building east of the ethnographic site where many young, unemployed Indian men hang out; some probably live on the street; some found flop houses or apartment hotels. None probably stayed or will stay long where he is, and that is the central problem.

The mobility and indefinite residence of young Indian men has been described as well by Lobo (1990), Bonvillain (1989) and Ackerman (1988). It is a cultural pattern with some historical precedent and one which certainly is relevant to the undercount of

American Indian people in cities (Lobo, Straus) as well as on reservations (Bonvillain, Ackerman). They are not "homeless," they are nomadic and thus very difficult to count.

It may be that the best way to address this pattern is by some kind of percentage estimation. Actual enumeration seems very unlikely to succeed. Age category distributions on census tapes should conform to documented norms in Indian communities around the country. A dip in the numbers of young Indian men reported can be expected to be due to enumeration difficulties rather than to actual numbers. A guestimate of additional population might be based on the normal distribution curves for the different age levels in specific Indian communities, reservation and urban.

The other major reason for undercount of minorities in this mixed neighborhood is the mis- or non-identification of individuals in particular racial categories. In some part, this is due to selective identification: speaking with an American Indian, individuals of Indian descent are apparently more likely to identify as Indian than with a non-Indian. Some possible explanations for this have been suggested above. An obvious implication would be to select as enumerators in mixed minority communities, members of the particular racial and/or ethnic groups represented in that community and, where possible, community members. The advantage of this was clear in the Cambodian building as well, where fear -- not of the census but of strangers -- doubtless accounted for some of the undercount and a language barrier exacerbated the problems.

The other apparent issue with regard to racial classification is misunderstanding of the categories by mail respondents and enumerators. Of particular concern are Cambodians, enumerated as such in the ethnic category but not as Asian in the racial category, perhaps due to misinterpretation of the list of Asian people supplied in the directions. The list of Asians (on the census form), intended only as examples, may have been understood as a definitive list of those to be censused as Asian. Cambodians did not appear on that list.

Mail respondents who identified as Cambodian perhaps did not realize that the racial category was also relevant. Directions on the 1990 census were complex for race and also for Hispanic origin. There is a need to distinguish race from ethnicity. Limited English language literacy further complicated the directions for many Cambodians in the ethnographic site.

Probably the best way to avoid this kind of omission in the future would be through the local Cambodian organization which connects to at least some of the people in the building and could provide orientation and information about filling out the forms as well as stress the importance for Cambodians of providing accurate demographic and racial data. While Indian outreach census workers had a clear presence in the ethnographic site, there was no evidence of such outreach through or to the Cambodian organizations beyond an awareness among the school age children of the census and some of its purposes. Census education through the schools might focus on the problem areas discovered in the 1990 census, racial classification being one of them.

The American Indian Community in Chicago and the 1990 Census

As discussed above, American Indian people are most likely to identify clearly as Indian in the context of interaction with another Indian. A special and interesting issue, then, relating to the undercount of American Indians is the nature of Indian communities in Chicago, other Indian communities and on reservations around the country. Indian communities are not localized in the manner which might be expected. While there are local concentrations of Indian people and certainly there are "portal neighborhoods" (personal communication, L. Brownrigg) into which new residents are likely to move, Indian people live widely scattered through the city and (especially southern) suburbs and nowhere in concentration significantly greater than that found in the ethnographic site. Concentrations of 20% American Indian population on a single city block simply do not occur in Chicago. The Indian community here has a center but no external boundaries: Indian people participating in the Indian community look to the center to hold them together. In Chicago, that center is located in the 10 different Indian organizations and most directly in the American Indian Center itself.

Because of the non-localized nature of the Chicago Indian community, Indian people are frequently not recognized by their neighbors as such and may not be concerned with asserting their Indian identity. A non-Indian enumerator, then, working from appearance or from a neighbor's testimony might well misjudge the racial classification of Indian people.

As Lobo has argued (1990), Indian communities incite us to reexamine our understanding of ethnic communities as "ghettos," discrete, localized geographic areas within which a single ethnic group predominates. There was no such Indian community in Chicago in 1991. Indeed, while the Uptown area is still widely recognized as the locus of the "Indian community", more and more Indian people are moving out of that area in search of work, better housing or better schools. This trend was clear in the 1980 census and reported in the <u>Demographic Profile of the Chicago Indian Community</u> (Marozas, 1984), that the growth in Indian population took place in the SMSA not in the city proper between 1970 and 1980.

Until 1833, Chicago was Indian land and Indian people lived scattered throughout the area in villages and family groups. New Indian people came and went in this community, trading, seeking new experiences, looking for a spouse or whatever, but there was never any great concentration of individuals in the stinky swamps which later became the city. The spatial pattern is similar today, although great numbers of non-Indian people now share the space: there are still no large concentrations of Indian people, and the dispersed nature of the Indian community is a major factor in the Indian undercount.

June, 1991 Chicago, Illinois

REFERENCES CITED

Ackerman, Lillian
1988 Residential mobility among the Colville Indians. Preliminary report, Joint Statistical Agreement 88-10 with Washington State University at Pullman. Ethnographic coverage evaluation of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Census Report # 2.

Ammar, Nawal
1991 Ethnographic research for Alternative Enumeration in the Black community in the Clay Arsenal neighborhood of Hartford, Connecticut. Paper presented at the Ethnographic Census Evaluation Research Seminar, June 1990, at Suitland, Maryland.

Aschenbrenner, Joyce
1989 Census undercount in a Black neighborhood. Final report Joint Statistical Agreement 87-21 with Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. Ethnographic coverage evaluation of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Census Report # 6.

1990 A community based study of the 1990 census undercount in a racially mixed area. Paper presented at the Ethnographic Census Evaluation Research Seminar, June 1990, at Suitland, Maryland.

Bonvillain, Nancy
1989 Residence patterns at the St. Regis Reservation. Preliminary report, JSA 89-15 with Research Foundation of State University of New York. Ethnographic exploratory report # 5.

Hamid, Ansley
1991 Observation-based follow up on Decennial Census in Central Harlem, New York City. Paper presented at the Ethnographic Census Evaluation Research Seminar, June 1990, at Suitland, Maryland.

Lobo, Susan
1990 Oakland's American Indian community: History, social organization and factors that contribute to census undercount. Preliminary report, Joint Statistical Agreement 89-19 with Intertribal Friendship House. Ethnographic exploratory

report # 12.

Marozas, Bryan
1984 Demographic profile of Chicago's American Indian community. Chicago, Illinois: NAES College.

Rynearson, Ann M.
1988 Lowland Lao refugees in St. Louis, Missouri: an analysis of residence patterns with relevance to to census. Preliminary report, Joint Statistical Agreement 88-7 with International Institute of St. Louis. Ethnographic coverage evaluation of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Census report # 1.

1989 Asian Americans in a mixed neighborhood. Final report, Joint Statistical Agreement 88-7 with International Institute of St. Louis. Ethnographic coverage evaluation of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Census report # 3.

1991 Asian Americans in a mixed neighborhood: a longitudinal study in St. Louis, Missouri. Paper presented at the Ethnographic Census Evaluation Research Seminar, June 1990, at Suitland, Maryland.