

Evaluation of the Facility Questionnaire (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing and Personal Visit)

FINAL REPORT

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

Neala Stevens

Planning, Research, and
Evaluation Division

U S C E N S U S B U R E A U

Helping You Make Informed Decisions

Intentionally Blank

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
1. BACKGROUND	1
1.1 Definitions	1
1.2 Data sources	1
1.3 Special place type codes	3
1.4 Questions to answer	4
2. METHODS	5
2.1 Sample design	5
2.2 Weighting	6
2.3 Statistical methods	6
2.4 Applying quality assurance procedures	7
3. LIMITS	7
4. RESULTS	8
4.1 How often did change occur in the special place type code from the SPFQ, to the Reinterview, and to the SP Advance Visit?	8
4.1 Do discrepancies in the special place type code differ by type of special place? ...	10
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	11
Acknowledgments	12
References	12
Appendix A: Comparison of the special place type codes chosen during the SPFQ and SP Advance Visit to the Reinterview	13
Appendix B: Comparison of the best Reinterview special place type code to the other Reinterview special place type codes	15

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. List of special place type codes	4
Table 2. Sample design summary	6
Table 3. Comparison of the special place type code in the SPFQ, Reinterview, and SP Advance Visit	8
Table 4. Comparison of the special place type code across the SPFQ, Reinterview, and SP Advance Visit	9
Table 5. Comparison of the special place type code for special places with a code of 14 or 15 in the Reinterview and/or SP Advance Visit	10
Table 6. Comparison of the special place type code for special places without a code of 14 or 15 in the Reinterview and/or SP Advance Visit	10
Table 7. Comparison of the special place type code in the SPFQ, Reinterview, and SP Advance Visit for large/complex special places versus all other types of special places	11
Table 8. Comparison of the SPFQ special place type code to the Reinterview special place type code	13
Table 9. Comparison of the SP Advance Visit special place type code to the Reinterview special place type code	14
Table 10. Comparison of the best Reinterview special place type code to the other Reinterview special place type codes	15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation compares the classification of special places, also known as special place type coding, collected at three different times during Census 2000. It specifically includes comparisons of the special place type code recorded during the:

1. Special Place Facility Questionnaire operation
2. Reinterview (also known as the Special Place Facility Evaluation) that the Planning Research and Evaluation Division conducted
3. Special Place Advance Visit operation

Special place type coding is conducted in order to determine the path the remainder of the interview will follow in the Special Place Facility Questionnaire operation and Special Place Advanced Visit operation. In addition, subsequent operations of data collection are dependent on it. For example, Field Division may use the special place type code to make future interviewer assignments in the Group Quarters Enumeration. This evaluation answers two questions related to special place type coding. The questions help describe the consistency of the special place type coding across the three operations listed above.

Please note that, although the Special Place Facility Questionnaire and Special Place Advance Visit operations recorded special place type codes, the primary purpose of these operations was to collect group quarters type codes. This evaluation focuses on special place type codes, and the conclusions in this report should not be applied to group quarters type codes.

Additionally, the 2010 Census special place/group quarters data collection plans are to emphasize group quarters type codes rather than special place type codes. Therefore, special place type coding results from this evaluation may not be influential to the 2010 design.

Additional limitations include differences between the Special Place/Census operations to the reinterview in terms of mode, respondent and data collection instrument. In addition, true organizational change (i.e. valid Special Place code differences) are not differentiated from coding discrepancies.

How often did change occur in the special place type code from the Special Place Facility Questionnaire, to the Reinterview, and to the Special Place Advance Visit?

About 25 percent of the special place codes changed from the Special Place Facility Questionnaire to the Reinterview and 38 percent of the special place type codes changed from the Reinterview to the Special Place Advance Visit. Omitting the Reinterview operation, 25 percent of the special place type codes changed from the Special Place Facility Questionnaire to the Special Place Advance Visit. However, of the 25 percent that changed from the Special Place Facility Questionnaire to the Special Place Advance Visit, 93.5 percent are different because they were deleted from the Census in the Special Place Advance Visit. Therefore, most of the differences that occurred between the SPFQ and the SP Advance Visit are because the special place was deleted from the census and not because of a change in the coding of the special place.

Do discrepancies in the special place type code differ by type of special place?

Discrepancies in the special place type code do differ somewhat by type of special place. Specifically, large/complex special places are more likely to have a discrepancy in the special place type code than all other special places. However, this difference may not be of practical significance since the odds of a small/non-complex special place having the same special place type code in all three operations is 1.27 times the odds of a large/complex special place having the same special place type code.

Recommendations

Please note that, although the Special Place Facility Questionnaire and Special Place Advance Visit operations recorded special place type codes, the primary purpose of these operations was to collect group quarters type codes. This evaluation focuses on special place type codes, and, the conclusions in this report should not be applied to group quarters type codes.

Additionally, the 2010 Census special place/group quarters data collection plans are to emphasize group quarters type codes rather than special place type codes. Therefore, special place type coding results from this evaluation may not be influential to the 2010 design.

We recommend that future evaluations base the comparison on the group quarters type code instead of or in addition to the special place type code. A group quarters type code comparison is more appropriate since it is the classification by which data are tabulated in census products.

1. BACKGROUND

This evaluation compares information collected about special places at three different times during Census 2000. It specifically includes comparisons of the special places type code recorded during (1) the Census 2000 Special Place Facility Questionnaire (SPFQ) operation, (2) the Reinterview operation (also referred to as the Special Place Facility Evaluation) that the Planning, Research, and Evaluation Division (PRED) conducted, and (3) the Special Place (SP) Advanced Visit operation.

Special place type coding is conducted in order to determine the path the remainder of the interview will follow in the Special Place Facility Questionnaire operation and Special Place Advanced Visit operation. In addition, subsequent operations of data collection are dependent on it. For example, Field Division (FLD) may use the special place type code to make future interviewer assignments in the Group Quarters (GQ) Enumeration. Coding the special place type is challenging because ‘it is neither easy nor straightforward to develop standardized definitions of “facility¹” and “facility type” to guide respondents to define and select the right reporting units.’ (Schwede 1998).

1.1 Definitions

A special place is a facility containing one or more group quarters where people live or stay, such as a college or university, nursing home, hospital, prison, hotel, migrant or seasonal farm worker camp, or military installation or ship.

A special place can include one or more GQs. A GQ is a living quarter in which unrelated people live or stay other than the usual house, apartment, or mobile home. A GQ is a special place or part of a special place.

1.2 Data Sources

Two of the three sources of data required for this evaluation came from extracts of production data from two Census 2000 operations. The SPFQ operation and the SP Advance Visit operation, which updated the SP/GQ Master File. This file of special places, associated GQs, and accompanying information assisted in the conducting of the GQ Enumeration. The GQ Enumeration could not have been conducted effectively without the use of the list of special places and their associated GQs created during the SPFQ operation and the SP Advance Visit.

The third source of data was the Reinterview which was an evaluation of special place type coding in the SPFQ operation and SP Advance Visit and was not used for production purposes.

The SPFQ operation occurred from November 1998 to November 1999. The Reinterview was conducted in January and February 2000. Coinciding slightly with the Reinterview, the SP

¹Special place type coding in some literature is also referred to as facility type coding.

Advance Visit took place in February and March 2000. The results of the SPFQ operation and SP Advance Visit enabled the GQ Enumeration to be conducted in April and May 2000.

1.2.1 Special Place Facility Questionnaire operation

During the 1990 census, the District Office staff involved in the SP Prelist Operation updated, added, and deleted special places from the SP Master Listing. This operation produced too many changes to be processed in time to update the SP Master Listing for enumeration operations. Because of the 1990 experience and improvements in technology, the SPFQ Team planned and implemented the SPFQ operation to update and correct the SP/GQ Master File for Census 2000. The SPFQ Team developed a paper questionnaire prototype for the SPFQ which was tested in telephone interviews during the summer of 1994 in preparation for the 1995 Census Test. The team used the results of that test to develop the SPFQ for the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal [both Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) and paper questionnaire versions]. They based the final SPFQ for Census 2000 on the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal SPFQ with minor changes (Schoch, 2001).

The Census 2000 SPFQ operation gathered information about each living quarter including the type of GQ, the contact person, the expected population on Census Day (4/1/00), geographic, and other pertinent information. The list of special places and their GQs was created from the 1990 SP/GQ Master File and many other sources, including the federal government, the Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates agencies, and private sector sources. The Census Bureau used the resulting updated list as the address list for GQ enumeration and control file for recording items like the GQ type codes, maximum population, etc.

There were three stages of interviewing in the SPFQ operation. The first stage was a CATI operation² conducted from November 1998 to August 1999. Second, a non-CATI telephone interview took place in the Local Census Offices (LCOs) for special places added as a result of LCO review. Finally, for facilities in which a telephone interview was not obtained, interviewers administered a personal visit interview from April to November 1999. The SPFQ used for the personal visit interview matched the SPFQ used for CATI.

1.2.2 Special Place Advance Visit operation

During Census 2000, enumerators conducted the SP Advance Visit for all special places to confirm and/or update information collected during the SPFQ operation and to discuss with the contact person the best time and method of enumeration. The SP Advance Visit operation occurred from February 2 to March 10, 2000.

² This was the first census where special place operations were automated using a CATI instrument to conduct the SPFQ operation.

1.2.3 Reinterview operation

PRED designed and managed the Reinterview survey. This work included developing the questionnaire and the associated interviewer and training materials, working with FLD staff to conduct interviews; and, working with National Processing Center staff to key the questionnaire data. Specially trained interviewers administered a redesigned personal visit SPFQ for the reinterview operation.

This independent operation occurred between the SPFQ operation and the SP Advance Visit operation. Unlike the SP Advance Visit, the interviewers working on the Reinterview did not have any knowledge of the special place type code chosen during the SPFQ operation. The Reinterview operation was not used for any production purposes and the data collected were only used for the purpose of this evaluation.

1.3 Special place type codes

In Census 2000, decennial census staff defined codes to categorize both special places and their associated GQs. This coding often described the service provided by the special place or GQ. They defined 12 special place type codes and 67 GQ codes. This evaluation focuses on the special place type codes.

Table 1 gives a list of the special place type codes. Notice that at the bottom of the list there are two codes that we added during our analysis. We added these codes to assist in the evaluation of cases that were possibly out of scope or deleted from the census (determined to not be a special place).

- For the Reinterview operation, we gave a special place type code of 14 to special places that had a missing special place type code and the interview status section on the questionnaire indicated the case was not a special place, didn't exist, or was a housing unit, that is, out of scope.
- For the SP Advance Visit, we gave a special place type code of 14 to those special places that were no longer in the census as a special place.
- For some cases in the Reinterview operation, we questioned the accuracy of the special place type code. The interviewer in the Reinterview operation recorded a special place type code on the questionnaire, but also indicated that the place was not a special place, didn't exist, or was a housing unit. Therefore, we gave these cases a special place type code of 15. For the purpose of determining whether or not a code changed from the Reinterview operation to the SP Advance Visit operation, we assumed that a code of 15 in the Reinterview operation was the same as a special place type code of 14 in the SP Advance Visit operation.

Table 1. List of special place type codes

Special place type code and description	
01	– Correctional institutions
02	– Juvenile institutions
03	– Nursing homes
04	– Hospitals, hospices, schools for handicapped
05	– College/University with dormitories
06*	– Military group quarters
07	– Emergency shelters
08	– Group homes / halfway houses
09	– YMCAs, YWCAs, hostels, convents, monasteries, worker dormitories
10	– Camps, campgrounds, marinas, campgrounds at racetracks
11	– Hotels and motels
12	– Other
14**	– For the Reinterview operation, this was a special place that had a missing special place type code from the Reinterview operation and the interview status from the reinterview operation indicated the case was not a special place, didn't exist, or was a housing unit. For the SP Advance Visit, this was a special place that was no longer in the census as a special place. – This code was not used for the SPFQ operation.
15**	– For the Reinterview operation, this was a special place that had a special place type code from the Reinterview operation but the interview status from the Reinterview operation indicates the case was not a special place, didn't exist, or was a housing unit. Therefore, there was some confusion as to the actual status of these special places. – This code was not used for the SPFQ operation and the SP Advance Visit operation.

* We excluded military group quarters in the sample design of this evaluation.

** We added these codes for analysis purposes.

1.4 Questions to answer

With this evaluation we hope to answer two questions about the special place type code:

- How often did change occur in the special place type code from the SPFQ operation, to the Reinterview, and to the SP Advanced Visit operation?
- Do discrepancies in the special place type code differ by type of special place? Specifically, by large/complex (universities/colleges and hospitals) special places versus all other types of special places.

2. METHODS

This section describes the sample design, the weights to account for the sample design and nonresponse, the statistical methods used to analyze the data, and the quality assurance procedures applied throughout the creation of the report.

2.1 Sample design

We selected a sample of Reinterview cases using a multistage sample design. A summary of the sample design is found in Table 2.

- In Stage I, we selected six Regional Census Centers (RCCs) including Charlotte, Chicago, Dallas, New York, Philadelphia, and Seattle. Within the Seattle RCC, we excluded all Alaska Local Census Offices (LCOs) to contain costs.
- In Stage II, or within each of the six RCCs, we selected eight LCOs. The number of LCOs per RCC from which we selected our sample ranged from 37 to 50.
- In Stage III, we selected approximately 42 special places from each of our selected LCOs. In this stage, there are two strata of special places, (1) large and complex special places and (2) others. Large and complex special places consisted of universities and hospitals (special place type codes of 04 and 05). Per LCO, we selected approximately 17 large and complex special places and 25 other special places, except in the New York RCC, where we selected approximately six large and complex special places and 36 other special places.³ (Within each LCO, the number of facilities from which we selected our sample ranged from 1 to 435).

We aimed for a final sample size of approximately 2,000 special places. In actuality, we had a sample size of 1,980 special places. We obtained a 90.6 percent response rate because we did not receive completed interviews from 187 special places in the Reinterview operation.

³We distributed the sample cases in the New York RCC differently from all other RCCs because this RCC had low counts of hospitals and universities per LCO. By reducing the number of sample cases for hospitals and universities and increasing all other, we better insured that we had a more constant resultant sample size of 42 cases per LCO.

Table 2. Sample design summary

Stage of selection	Sample units	Type of selection procedures	Number in universe	Number in sample	Stratification?
I	RCCs	simple random sample without replacement	$N_I = 12$	$n_I = 6$	None
II	LCOs	systematic	$37 \leq N_{Ikk} \leq 50$	$n_{Ikk} = 8$	None, but ordered where LCOs were contiguous
III	Facilities	stratified and systematic within strata	$1 \leq N_{Ikk} \leq 435$	$n_{Ikk} = 42$	By “large” and “small” facilities

2.2 Weighting

Because weighted estimates help give an unbiased estimate of the population, we used weights to take into account the sample design and nonresponse. We used sample weights to take into account the three stages of sampling and nonresponse weights to take into account the special places that did not respond in the Reinterview operation.

2.3 Statistical Methods

To answer the questions in this evaluation, we used percentages and their associated standard errors to show how the special place type codes changed from operation to operation. We calculated these percentages using the weights that account for the sample design and nonresponse. We calculated the standard errors using the Jackknife replication method. When we calculate the standard errors, we only used the first stage of sample selection (the selection of the six RCCs) for replication purposes. Therefore, we only accounted for the variance due to sampling of the RCCs in the standard error. We did not account for the variance due to sampling of the LCOs within each RCC and the sampling of the special places within each LCO in the standard error. We have disregarded the finite population correction, so the standard errors are an overestimate and this should help compensate for only using the first stage of sample selection.

We used the chi-square test to determine if there was an association between the size/complexity of a special place and whether the special place type code differed among the three operations. We used the odds ratio to determine the strength of the association. The only limit to using the chi-square test is that we were unable to account for the complex sample design when calculating this statistic and the associated p-value. Therefore, the test may show a significant difference in the odds ratio when there actually isn't a significant difference.

2.4 Applying quality assurance procedures

We applied quality assurance procedures throughout the creation of this report. They encompassed how we determined evaluation methods, created specifications for project procedures and software, designed and reviewed computer systems, developed clerical and computer procedures, analyzed data, and prepared this report.

3. LIMITS

There are five main limits to this evaluation:

- Although the Special Place Facility Questionnaire and Special Place Advance Visit operations recorded special place type codes, the primary purpose of these operations was to collect group quarters type codes. Special place type coding was designed to identify a broad type of facility, and was not intended to be a precise classification. Special place type coding results from this evaluation should not be applied to the quality of group quarters coding.
- We cannot directly compare the SPFQ special place coding for Personal Visit versus CATI. We originally planned to implement an experimental design during the SPFQ phase by sending half of our sample to Personal Visit and the other half to CATI. Timing issues prevented this from occurring and all cases in the SPFQ phase were sent to the CATI operation and unresolved cases sent for Personal Visit. Alternatively, all cases in the Reinterview phase were completed with a Personal Visit. This evaluation cannot definitively separate the effects of mode (personal visit versus CATI) from the changes made to the redesigned questionnaire.
- We cannot account for changes in special place type coding that are the result of an organizational change. For example, if a special place discontinued a service or provided additional services that were not in place during the early collection period, our analysis treats this as a discrepancy.
- Results include special place type codes potentially provided by different respondents (across each operation). The perception of the special place type may not be consistent among different respondents at a special place, and may be the cause of some of the differences observed.
- We are unable to determine the impact of our redesigned questionnaire used during the Reinterview because there is no control questionnaire to compare against the redesigned questionnaire. It was not possible to incorporate a control questionnaire during the Reinterview because of case management issues and insufficient knowledge about the cases to make assignments based on similar facility characteristics.

4. RESULTS

4.1 How often did change occur in the special place type code from the SPFQ, to the Reinterview, and to the SP Advance Visit?

When we include the Reinterview operation in the comparison of special place type codes, Table 3 shows that 25.1 percent of the special place codes changed from the SPFQ operation to the Reinterview and 37.8 percent of the special place type codes changed from the Reinterview to the SP Advance Visit.

For the Reinterview operation, the interviewers had to determine the best code to describe the special place. However, unlike the SPFQ and SP Advance Visit operation, the interviewers also asked if there were any other special place type codes that described the special place. In the Reinterview, 23.5 percent of the special places (standard error = 1.33) chose at least one “other” special place type code in addition to the “best” special place type code. It is interesting to note that for the 25.1 percent of special place codes that had different codes between the SPFQ and the Reinterview, 21.3 percent (standard error = 2.38) chose the SPFQ special place code as an “other” special place type code in the Reinterview.

If we don’t include the results of the Reinterview operation, Table 3 shows that 25.4 percent of the special place type codes changed from the SPFQ to the SP Advance Visit. However, of these special places, 93.5 percent (standard error = 2.42) are different because they were deleted from the census in the SP Advance Visit. Therefore, most of the differences that occurred between the SPFQ and the SP Advance Visit are because the special place was deleted from the census and not because of a change in the coding of the special place.

Table 3. Comparison of the special place type code in the SPFQ, Reinterview, and SP Advance Visit

Comparison of the special place type code between SPFQ and Reinterview			Comparison of the special place type code between Reinterview and SP Advance Visit			Comparison of the special place type code between SPFQ and SP Advance Visit		
Code Comparison	Percent	s.e.	Code Comparison	Percent	s.e.	Code Comparison	Percent	s.e.
Same	74.9	2.45	Same	62.2	2.03	Same	74.6	1.96
Different	25.1	2.45	Different	37.8	2.03	Different	25.4	1.96

Note: s.e. is standard error and n = 1,793

Table 4 shows that 58.5 percent of the special place type codes stayed the same between the SPFQ, the Reinterview, and the SP Advance Visit. As shown in the second to last row of Table 4, we can see that 16.1 percent of the special place type codes changed from the SPFQ to the Reinterview and from the Reinterview to the SP Advance Visit, but the code actually stayed the same during the production operations (SPFQ and SP Advance Visit).

Table 4. Comparison of the special place type code across the SPFQ, Reinterview, and SP Advance Visit

Comparison of the special place type code for SPFQ and Reinterview	Comparison of the special place type code for Reinterview and SP Advance Visit	Comparison of the special place type code for SPFQ and SP Advance Visit	Percent	Standard Error
Same	Same	Same	58.5	2.36
Same	Different	Different	16.4	0.82
Different	Same	Different	3.7	0.89
Different	Different	Same	16.1	1.13
Different	Different	Different	5.3	1.30

Note: n = 1,793

To see how much influence the Reinterview special place type codes of 14 and 15 and SP Advance Visit special place type code of 14 had on the comparison of special place codes in the SPFQ, Reinterview, and SP Advance Visit, we separated these special place type codes from the rest of the special place type codes. We used the special place type codes of 14 and 15 to identify special places that had an interview status from the Reinterview operation indicating the case was not a special place, didn't exist, or was a housing unit. We also used the special place type code of 14 to identify a special place that no longer existed after the SP Advance Visit.

Tables 5 and 6 give a comparison of special places with a special place type code of 14 or 15 in the Reinterview operation and/or SP Advance Visit versus those without this code. From Table 6, we can see that without these special place type codes, 80.4 percent of the special places are the same among the three operations. This indicates that the coding across the three operations was highly consistent. However, we see that 17.5 percent of the special places had the same code between the SPFQ and SP Advance Visit, but it differed from the Reinterview special place type code, indicating that the Reinterview phase was not as consistent as the SPFQ and SP Advance Visit.

Table 5. Comparison of special place type codes for special places with a code of 14 or 15 in the Reinterview and/or SP Advance Visit

Comparison of the special place type code for SPFQ and Reinterview	Comparison of the special place type code for Reinterview and SP Advance Visit	Comparison of the special place type code for SPFQ and SP Advance Visit	Percent	Standard Error
Same	Same	Same	NA	NA
Same	Different	Different	56.7	5.42
Different	Same	Different	12.2	2.61
Different	Different	Same	12.2	1.98
Different	Different	Different	19.0	3.72

Note: NA indicates not applicable. n = 520

Table 6. Comparison of special place type codes for special places without a code of 14 or 15 in the Reinterview and/or SP Advance Visit

Comparison of the special place type code for SPFQ and Reinterview	Comparison of the special place type code for Reinterview and SP Advance Visit	Comparison of the special place type code for SPFQ and SP Advance Visit	Percent	Standard Error
Same	Same	Same	80.4	1.79
Same	Different	Different	1.3	0.42
Different	Same	Different	0.5	0.25
Different	Different	Same	17.5	1.75
Different	Different	Different	0.3	0.12

Note: n = 1,273

For additional information on how each special place type code recorded in the SPFQ operation and SP Advance Visit changed in the Reinterview operation, refer to Tables 8 and 9 of Appendix A. Also, for each “best” special place type code reported in the Reinterview operation, Table 10 of Appendix B shows the “other” special place type codes chosen in the Reinterview operation.

4.2 Do discrepancies in the special place type code differ by type of special place?

Discrepancies that occur in the special place type do differ by type of special place. We used the chi-square test to determine if there was an association between the size/complexity of a special place and whether the special place type code differed among the three operations. We used the odds ratio to determine the strength of the association. The chi-square statistic and the associated p-value (Chi-square = 177.9, p-value <0.0001) indicates there is an association between the size/complexity of a special place and whether the special place type code differed among the three operations.

The odds ratio of 1.27 indicates that the odds of a small/non-complex special place having the same special place type code in all three operations is 1.27 times the odds of a large/complex special place having the same special place type code. Therefore large/complex special places are more likely to have a discrepancy in the special place type code than all other special places, although this may not be of practical significance.

Table 7 shows where the differences in special place type codes occurred between large/complex special places and all other types of special places.

Table 7. Comparison of the special place type code* in the SPFQ, Reinterview, and SP Advance Visit for large/complex special places versus all other types of special places**

Comparison of special place type code for large/complex special places** in the . . .				Comparison of special place type code for all other types of special places combined in the . . .			
SPFQ and Reinterview	Reinterview and SP Advance Visit	Percent	s.e.	SPFQ and Reinterview	Reinterview and SP Advance Visit	Percent	s.e.
Same	Same	53.3	4.61	Same	Same	59.2	2.65
Same	Different	25.4	4.53	Same	Different	15.2	0.79
Different	Same	4.1	1.04	Different	Same	3.7	0.93
Different	Different	17.2	2.76	Different	Different	21.9	2.17

* Includes special places with a Reinterview special place type code of 14 and 15 and/or a SP Advance Visit special place type code of 14

** Large/complex special places include hospitals and universities (special place type code of 04 and 05)

Note: s.e. is standard error

n = 590 for large/complex special places and n = 1,203 for all other types of special places

5. Recommendations

Please note that, although the Special Place Facility Questionnaire and Special Place Advance Visit operations recorded special place type codes, the primary purpose of these operations was to collect group quarters type codes. This evaluation focuses on special place type codes, and, the conclusions in this report should not be applied to group quarters type codes.

Additionally, the 2010 Census special place/group quarters data collection plans are to emphasize group quarters type codes rather than special place type codes. Therefore, special place type coding results from this evaluation may not be influential to the 2010 design.

We recommend that future evaluations base the comparison on the group quarters type code instead of or in addition to the special place type code. A group quarters type code comparison is more appropriate since it is the classification by which data are tabulated in census products.

Acknowledgments

PRED would like to thank the following people for their contributions and assistance in finalizing this report:

Stephen Ash
Courtney Stapleton

References

Schoch, Sharon, *Program Master Plan: Census 2000 Special Place/Group Quarters Inventory Development*, Census 2000 Informational Memorandum No. 113, Bureau of the Census, September 10, 2001.

Schwede, Laurie, "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Defining the Basic Statistical Units in a Facility Census," *American Statistical Association Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section*, p 232-237, 1998.

Appendix A

Comparison of the special place type codes chosen during the SPFQ and SP Advance Visit to the Reinterview

Table 8. Comparison of the SPFQ special place type code to the Reinterview special place type code

Special place type code in the SPFQ	Chose same special place type code in the Reinterview		Chose “other” special place type in the Reinterview **		
	Percent	Standard Error	Special place type code	Percent	Standard Error
01 Correctional institutions	92.4	3.45	***	***	***
02 Juvenile institutions	58.9	19.17	***	***	***
03 Nursing homes	83.2	2.99	04	6.1	1.38
			08	6.4	2.19
			03	4.8	1.52
04 Hospitals, hospices, schools for handicapped	75.5	4.75	08	8.3	2.09
			14	4.6	2.15
			05 College/University with dormitories	85.3	4.05
07 Emergency shelters	79.3	2.09	08	6.2	1.83
			03	11.1	3.47
			04	2.6	1.09
			07	2.6	0.73
			12	3.5	1.10
08 Group homes / halfway houses	65.9	3.10	14	3.0	0.94
			15	4.4	1.41
			07	4.3	1.85
			12	4.0	1.95
09 YMCAs, YWCAs, hostels, convents, monasteries, worker dormitories	74.8	5.29	14	5.0	3.45
			15	4.4	1.87
			10 Camps, campgrounds, marinas, campgrounds at racetracks	67.5	1.82
11 Hotels and motels	***	***	***	***	***
12 Other*	***	***	***	***	***

* No one chose the special place code of 12 in the SPFQ operation.

** Not all of the special place type codes chosen in the Reinterview are included due to insufficient sample size.

*** Data withheld due to insufficient sample size

Table 9. Comparison of the SP Advance Visit special place type code to the Reinterview special place type code chosen

Special place type code in the SP Advance Visit	Chose same special place type code in the Reinterview		Chose “other” special place type in Reinterview **		
	Percent	Standard Error	Special place type code	Percent	Standard Error
01 Correctional institutions	92.5	2.55	***	***	***
02 Juvenile institutions	***	***	***	***	***
03 Nursing homes	86.0	3.56	04	4.9	1.65
			08	4.9	2.44
04 Hospitals, hospices, schools for handicapped	75.5	5.94	03	7.4	2.25
			08	8.4	2.23
05 College/University with dormitories	87.3	3.83	***	***	***
07 Emergency shelters	83.0	2.24	***	***	***
08 Group homes / halfway houses	66.0	3.21	03	11.7	3.94
			07	4.2	1.17
			15	3.4	1.11
09 YMCAs, YWCAs, hostels, convents, monasteries, worker dormitories	78.7	3.65	07	4.5	1.62
10 Camps, campgrounds, marinas, campgrounds at racetracks	76.5	6.49	***	***	***
11 Hotels and motels	***	***	***	***	***
12 Other	***	***	***	***	***
14 Deleted from the Census as a special place	8.3	3.12	01	4.6	1.52
			03	11.7	2.19
			04	10.5	2.26
			05	3.0	0.82
			07	12.3	3.73
			08	19.2	1.41
			09	10.7	2.56
			10	4.3	1.11
12	6.7	1.34			
			15	5.7	2.11

** Not all of the special place type codes chosen in the Reinterview are included due to insufficient sample size.

*** Data withheld due to insufficient sample size

Appendix B

Table 10. Comparison of the “best” Reinterview special place type code to the “other” Reinterview special place type codes

“Best” Reinterview special place type code	No “other” Reinterview special place type chosen		Chose “other” special place type in Reinterview **		
	Percent	Standard Error	Special place type code	Percent	Standard Error
01 Correctional institutions	92.7	3.00	***	***	***
02 Juvenile institutions	80.7	10.37	***	***	***
03 Nursing homes	79.0	4.37	04	15.5	4.94
04 Hospitals, hospices, schools for handicapped	70.4	5.18	03	17.7	3.71
05 College/University with dormitories	93.9	2.10	***	***	***
07 Emergency shelters	70.4	4.00	08	7.1	3.10
			09	11.6	1.65
			02	3.4	0.53
08 Group homes / halfway houses	78.7	1.92	03	5.5	1.49
			04	5.8	2.06
09 YMCAs, YWCAs, hostels, convents, monasteries, worker dormitories	86.0	0.86	07	8.4	2.96
10 Camps, campgrounds, marinas, campgrounds at racetracks	94.7	2.52	***	***	***
11 Hotels and motels	58.3	10.85	***	***	***
12 Other	82.8	5.85	***	***	***

** Not all of the special place type codes chosen in the Reinterview are included due to insufficient sample size.

*** Data withheld due to insufficient sample size

