

September 22, 2003

The Enumeration of Colonias in Census 2000: Perspectives of Ethnographers and Census Enumerators

FINAL REPORT

This evaluation study 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.

Manuel de la Puente
David Stemper

Statistical Research Division

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | <i>ii</i> |
| 1. BACKGROUND | 1 |
| 2. METHODS | 2 |
| 2.1 Site selection | 2 |
| 2.2 Data collection | 2 |
| 2.2.1 Ethnographic fieldwork | 2 |
| 2.2.2 Focus groups with census enumerators and crew leaders | 3 |
| 3. LIMITS | 4 |
| 4. FINDINGS | 4 |
| 4.1 Findings from ethnographic research | 4 |
| 4.1.1 Irregular housing | 4 |
| 4.1.2 Little or no knowledge of English and limited formal education | 6 |
| 4.1.3 Concerns regarding confidentiality | 11 |
| 4.1.4 Complex and fluid households | 14 |
| 4.2 Findings from focus groups with enumerators and crew leaders | 15 |
| 4.2.1 Enumerator and crew leader training | 15 |
| 4.2.2 Census materials | 16 |
| 4.2.3 Enumeration areas | 17 |
| 4.2.4 Colonia residents | 18 |
| 4.2.5 The census questionnaire | 18 |
| 5. CONCLUSIONS | 19 |
| 6. RECOMMENDATIONS | 21 |
| References | 22 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Colonias are generally unincorporated and low income residential subdivisions, lacking basic infrastructure and services along the border between the U.S. and Mexico. These settlements have been in existence for decades, but the exodus of the poor to colonias began in full force during the 1980s and 1990s. The low cost of land in colonias provided opportunities for home ownership and relief from higher housing costs in border cities such as El Paso, Texas and Brownsville, Texas.

The aim of this report is to provide qualitative information on how Census 2000 was conducted in selected colonias. This information comes from two sources. The first source is four ethnographic studies conducted by ethnographers with field work experience in colonias and with knowledge of these settlements working under contract for the Census Bureau. The second data source includes the results of focus groups with census enumerators and crew leaders who worked in the selected colonias studied by the ethnographers. These focus groups were conducted by staff from the Statistical Research Division and the Planning, Research and Evaluation Division.

Important findings include the following:

- Ethnographers from all four colonias or sites identified and documented the presence of four major barriers to census enumeration. These are: irregular housing, little or no knowledge of English and limited formal education, concerns regarding confidentiality, and complex and fluid households. However, the extent to which these barriers posed problems for Census 2000 enumeration and the Census Bureau's success in dealing with these obstacles varied across the four colonias.
- Irregular housing appeared to be an obstacle in all four colonias. However, ethnographic observations revealed that, for the most part, census enumerators were able to successfully negotiate the obstacles presented by irregular housing. Ethnographic data reveal that this is especially the case in the colonia in El Paso County, Texas where cultural facilitators were used and where update/enumerate procedures were implemented. Focus groups with census enumerators and crew leaders corroborate this ethnographic finding.
- Limited reading skills and little or no knowledge of English was cited as an obstacle to enumeration in all four colonias. Regardless of site, the need for a Spanish language census form that can be easily administered by enumerators and readily understood by respondents was documented by all ethnographers. For the most part, the Spanish language guide had limited use and in-depth interviews revealed that respondents did not successfully use the 1-800 number to request Spanish language census forms.

- All ethnographers reported that colonia residents expressed concerns regarding the confidentiality of census data. Lack of trust in government and leeriness of non-colonia residents prevailed across all four sites. However, it appears that, for the most part, these concerns were counterbalanced by Census Bureau efforts to promote Census 2000 via paid advertisement in the Spanish language media. According to ethnographic accounts these efforts by the Census Bureau were very well received in all four colonias. All ethnographers claim that Census Bureau outreach efforts targeted at Spanish speakers contributed to the success of Census 2000. This finding was substantiated by data from focus groups with census enumerators and crew leaders.
- Complex households and households with mobile and ambiguous members were prevalent in all four colonias. However, this situation was particularly pronounced in the colonia situated in Riverside County because of the sizeable number of migrant workers residing in this county. While this report cannot make definitive statements about coverage, it appears, based on ethnographic observations, that census enumerators were for the most part successful in identifying members residing in these complex and highly mobile households. Focus groups with Census Bureau enumerators and crew leaders also suggest that these tenuous household members were identified on the form. This success can be largely attributed to the persistence of census enumerators and the Census Bureau's promotion efforts targeted at Spanish speakers.
- Although colonias on the U.S./Mexico border are, for the most part, ethnically homogeneous there is consensus among ethnographers that it is inappropriate to assume the same degree of homogeneity on other key dimensions such as language, the extent of social cohesion (i.e. community) among colonia residents and the level of infrastructure development.

Recommendations based on this research include:

- Consider revising the training method and training materials for enumerators and crew leaders working in colonias. Emphasize classroom training less and emphasize on-the-job training or training in the field. Make training materials more user-friendly by compiling materials in one, two or more binders that could be used easily as a reference guide.
- Use the initiative of employing cultural facilitators and *promotoras* developed by the Dallas Regional Office, Texas and implemented in the El Paso County, Texas site as a starting point and initiate research that will inform the Census Bureau on how to best use these initiatives in colonias in all four border states.

- Continue and expand the practice of hiring Spanish speaking enumerators who are

familiar with colonias. However, don't assume that this measure alone, without training on how to enumerate in Spanish, will be adequate in addressing language issues associated with enumerating Spanish speakers with relatively low levels of education and limited or no knowledge of English.

- Continue to use targeted paid advertizing in both English and Spanish.
- Initiate research that will help the Census Bureau determine if mailing out Spanish language census forms in 2010 is a viable strategy.

1. BACKGROUND

Colonias are generally unincorporated and low income residential subdivisions, lacking basic infrastructure and services along the border between the U.S. and Mexico. These settlements have been in existence for decades, but the exodus of the poor to colonias began in full force during the 1980s and 1990s (Chapa and del Pinal, 1993). The low cost of land in colonias provided opportunities for home ownership and relief from higher housing costs in border cities such as El Paso and Brownsville.

The report uses data provided by experienced ethnographers in their field reports to identify and describe barriers to the census enumeration of colonia residents. The report also relies on the views and opinions regarding the conduct of Census 2000 obtained from census enumerators and crew leaders whose assignment areas included one of the four colonias studied by the ethnographers. This information was collected through focus groups conducted by staff from Statistical Research Division and Planning, Research and Evaluation Divisions.

A total of four ethnographic studies (Campbell 2001; Coronado and , 2001, Du Bry and Palerm, 2001; and Velez-Ibanez and Nunez, 2001) were conducted during the conduct of Census 2000. Each study focused on one colonia which we refer to as sites in this report. Two sites were situated in Dona Ana County in New Mexico, one site was located in El Paso County, Texas and the fourth and last site was situated in Riverside County, California.

In order to preserve the confidentiality of the site and the privacy of site residents, each ethnographer gave a pseudonym to the colonia or site in their study. These pseudonyms will be used in this report. The colonia in El Paso County is known as "Cotton." One of the colonias in Dona Ana County is named "Nueva Esperanza" and the second is known as "El Recuerdo." The last and fourth colonia in Riverside County is called "Date Grove."

These four ethnographic studies were conducted in order to better understand the barriers to census enumeration in the selected colonias. This information was obtained by professional ethnographers through unobtrusive observation, ethnographic interviews and focus groups with community residents. The ethnographic studies identified four major barriers to Census 2000 in the four sites. These are: irregular housing, little or no knowledge of English and limited formal education, concerns regarding confidentiality, and complex and fluid households (including residential mobility).

To obtain a more balanced and complete picture of how Census 2000 was conducted in the four sites or colonias SRD and PRED staff traveled to the local census offices (LCOs) in Riverside County, California, Dona Ana County, New Mexico, and El Paso County, Texas and conducted a total of nine focus groups with census enumerators, four focus groups with crew leaders and crew leader assistants, and two focus groups with cultural facilitators were conducted during summer 2000. In all, over 50 enumerators, more than 20 crew leaders and crew leader assistants, and about 10 cultural facilitators participated in these focus groups. The major objective of these focus groups was to obtain the views and opinions of census enumerators and crew leaders on how Census 2000 was conducted in the four sites.

Nueva Esperanza and El Recuerdo situated in Dona Ana County in New Mexico and Date Grove located in Riverside County in California were update/leave¹ areas, while Cotton in El Paso County in Texas was enumerated using update/enumerate.² Thus enumerators and crew leaders from New Mexico and California who participated in the focus groups described their experiences with update/leave and non response follow up, while their counterparts from Texas shared their experiences with the update/enumerate method. Moreover, the Texas site was the only site where cultural facilitators were available thus the only two focus groups with cultural facilitators were conducted with individuals in Texas who served in this capacity.

2. METHODS

2.1 Site Selection

A number of factors were considered in selecting the four colonias in this study. Because we wanted geographic representation at least one site was established in three of the four border states (California, New Mexico, and Texas). Local ethnographers with a Ph.D. in one of the social sciences and with substantial ethnographic field work and experience in colonias were consulted in order to identify colonias that differed along key dimension such as, infrastructure development and location in or near urban areas versus location in the outskirts of the city. The ethnographers we consulted offered colonias as candidates for the study. Included in this submission was a physical and sociological description of the colonia along with documentation of the qualification of the ethnographer to do the work. Based on these submissions and consideration of the aforementioned factors Census Bureau staff in SRD and PRED selected four sites. These four sites are not intended to be statistically representative of colonias in the aforementioned border states (see Limitations section below for more information).

2.2 Data collection

2.2.1 Ethnographic fieldwork

Four ethnographic studies, one for each site, were conducted independently and by four different teams of ethnographers, however, the methodology used in all four sites was the same. In addition to ethnographic observations of how the Census 2000 enumeration was conducted, ethnographers conducted ethnographic interviews and more structured in-depth interviews with individuals from at least 25 different households per site. In each site ethnographers were asked to conduct four to five focus groups with community residents in order to gauge census

¹ Update/leave is a method of enumeration which the enumerators deliver decennial census forms for return by mail and at the same time update the census mailing list.

² Update/enumerate is a method of enumeration which enumerators canvass the areas, using and updating census maps and address registers and completing census questionnaires for all occupied and vacant housing units.

awareness and views and opinions about Census 2000.

The objective of this data collection effort was to obtain, for each of the four sites, information on how the census enumeration was conducted and gauge the level of census awareness and attitudes about the Census 2000 among community residents.

2.2.2 Focus groups with census enumerators and crew leaders

SRD and PRED staff traveled to the local census offices (LCOs) in Riverside County, California, Dona Ana County, New Mexico, and El Paso County, Texas and conducted a total of nine focus groups with census enumerators, four focus groups with crew leaders and crew leader assistants, and two focus groups with cultural facilitators during summer 2000.

Focus group participants were identified by the local census offices in Las Cruces, NM, El Paso, TX and Palm Springs, CA. These local census offices were responsible for the enumeration of our four sites situated in their respective states. Eligibility for focus group participation required that enumerators and crew leaders had been assigned to one of the four sites. These enumerators and crew leaders had to be involved in the enumeration of other areas as well as the enumeration of one of the study sites as a prerequisite for participating in the focus groups.

Focus group participants were paid their regular hourly wage. Participation was voluntary and participants were assured confidentiality. All focus groups were audio taped with the permission of the participant. Most focus groups were conducted in English but some were conducted in both English and Spanish.

The focus groups had three major objectives. The first objective was to obtain feedback from enumerator and crew leaders on the training they received before they were assigned to the field. Our interest was to determine the adequacy of the training, from the point of view of both the enumerators and crew leaders, and to determine what aspects of the training can be improved. Our second objective was to capture the reactions, views, and opinions of the enumerators and crew leaders regarding the study sites. We had already obtained this information from the ethnographers and we wanted to get comparable information from enumerators and crew leaders. And the third and last major objective was to obtain information that the Census Bureau can use to improve its enumeration of colonia residents in its surveys and future censuses.

3. LIMITS

Because this research is not based on probability samples, the findings reported herein are not statistically generalizable. This research is an exploratory study designed and intended to provide

insights, not ordinarily available in statistical studies, on the potential obstacle to enumeration in the selected colonias in Census 2000. Views and opinions from community residents and census enumerators were obtained through qualitative research methods such as ethnographic interviews, in-depth interviews, and focus groups. These approaches provide rich qualitative information but not statistically generalizable results.

The aim of this research is not to draw statistical conclusions but rather to identify barriers to census enumeration in the selected colonias and provide insight into how these barriers were addressed during Census 2000. The views and opinions obtained from community residents are intended to portray how Census 2000 was perceived by these residents and gauge the level of awareness of Census 2000.

The information obtained through focus groups from census enumerators and crew leaders was collected to better understand how Census 2000 was conducted in these communities from the point of view individuals who worked as enumerators in these communities. These data are not intended to be used to draw statistical conclusions (and in fact we have not portrayed our findings in this way.)

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Findings From Ethnographic Research

4.1.1 Irregular housing

Ethnographers from all four sites reported the presence of irregular housing. However, the extent to which irregular housing posed problems for Census 2000 enumeration varied across sites. Characteristics of irregular housing include: conflicting or non-existent housing unit number or designation; housing units that may look like single units but are really more than one housing unit; and housing units that are hidden from view. In colonias, irregular housing also include occupied housing units that are in stages of construction and many appear unfinished and uninhabited.

Irasema Coronado and Duncan Earle describe the housing in Nueva Esperanza in Dona Ana County as follows:

Residents in this colonia generally live on one-acre lots. However, there are many trailers and campers on one-acre lots. What is happening in some cases is that a person owns the acre and is now selling parts of it to other relatives. However, this is an informal arrangement and there is only one address on the acre lot regardless of how many trailers and campers there are. We noticed that many families were dividing up their acre to make room for their children's trailers and campers in the same place. Interestingly, young people see this as a real advantage, living next to parents and in

some cases living rent-free. Obviously, multiple residences with a single address represent a possible barrier to census enumeration. (Coronado and Earle, 2001: 13).

Howard Campbell also describes a similar situation in Cotton in El Paso County.

It is not uncommon to find housing added on to a trailer or housing units that are occupied and also in the process of being completed or renovated. The ethnographers also observed housing units that appeared to be unoccupied but were occupied. In some cases there were multiple housing units on the same lot but only one address. Also common were smaller housing units hidden behind a large housing unit or hidden behind bushes or other obstacles. (Campbell, 2001: 11).

Coronado and Earle noted in their report that irregular housing presented difficulty for the census enumerators they observed. However, they believe that these difficulties can be overcome by the Census Bureau.

We contend that the physical obstacles to enumeration can be easily overcome if enumerators are familiar with the region and the population. Moreover, the willingness of the census to transcend physical obstacles is a function of attitude, political will, and allocation of resources. (Coronado and Earle, 2001: 25)

This indeed appears to have been the case in Cotton in El Paso County where "cultural facilitators" were used to work with census enumerators. Campbell describes how the difficulties presented by irregular housing in Cotton were addressed by using cultural facilitators.

Often two houses built by the owner are located on the same lot but it is not clear whether both are inhabited at any given time. The pattern of building or placing a second dwelling behind the home is an especially difficult problem for enumeration because of the lack of visibility of the second structure. This occurred several times during our observations of enumerators. In several cases the cultural facilitator (a native of Cotton) noticed a second house on a lot that was ignored by the enumerator. (Campbell, 2001: 11)

In his report Campbell provides other examples of how cultural facilitators successfully assisted census enumerators with the enumeration process. For example in one situation the cultural facilitator assisted the census enumerator during the interview. According to Campbell the result was more accurate data for the household (Campbell, 2001: 16).

Irregular housing was also a feature of the Date Grove site in Riverside County. Although this area had a large migrant farm worker population, to the casual observer, the community appeared to be a residential area with easily identifiable housing units. Travis Du Bry and Juan-Vincente Palerm describe their site as follows:

In summary, what may appear as a place where simple enumeration can take place is not what it seems. There are the easily identified residential houses and apartments, but there are also dwellings to be found throughout the Date Grove area. In Date Grove itself there are the residential homes, but behind and within each are extra dwellings that are easily overlooked or hidden from view. In the hinterlands, there are dwellings in trailer parks, isolated compounds, agricultural equipment yards, and hidden away in fields and groves. (Du Bry and Palerm, 2001: 26).

4.1.2 Little or no knowledge of English and limited formal education

Little or no knowledge of English and limited formal education was identified by all ethnographers as a key barrier to enumeration during the conduct of Census 2000. However, the extent to which this barrier was successfully negotiated differed across sites. All ethnographers observed census enumerators in the colonias studied. However, it is important to put these observations in context with the enumeration procedures used in each site. Nueva Esperanza and El Recuerdo situated in Dona Ana County in New Mexico and Date Grove located in Riverside County in California were update/leave³ areas, while Cotton in El Paso County in Texas was enumerated using update/enumerate.⁴ Thus ethnographers conducting fieldwork in Nueva Esperanza, El Recuerdo and Date Grove observed the update of Census Bureau address lists and maps and the delivery of census forms. These ethnographers also observed nonresponse follow up in these sites.

In Cotton, the fourth colonia in El Paso County, the enumeration procedure was update/enumerate. Thus in this site ethnographers observed this procedure and had the opportunity to see the initial enumeration conducted in-person by census enumerators whereas in the other three colonias nonresponse follow-up interviews were the only formal enumerator-responder interaction observed.

With this background in mind, all ethnographers reported that little or no knowledge of English was a barrier. However, this barrier was successfully overcome in some cases and not dealt with appropriately in others.

The language barrier was relatively more successfully addressed in Cotton, where update/enumerate and cultural facilitators were used, then in the other three colonias where update/leave was conducted and cultural facilitators were not used. However, Campbell's observations indicate that the absence of a Spanish language form posed problems, even if the Spanish language guide was made available. Campbell observed the following:

³ Update/leave is a method of enumeration which the enumerators deliver decennial census forms for return by mail and at the same time update the census mailing list.

⁴ Update/enumerate is a method of enumeration which enumerators canvass the areas, using and updating census maps and address registers and completing census questionnaires for all occupied and vacant housing units.

In the cases we observed, the respondents were questioned in Spanish. The enumerators used the English census form questions and translated them into Spanish. Although the enumerators carried a job aid with Spanish equivalents of the questions, they seldom consulted it and relied on their own Spanish abilities. This created a number of problems that could be considered barriers to enumeration . (Campbell, 2001: 13).

It is important to note that Cotton residents have very low levels of education. Campbell states that in the course of his fieldwork he interviewed over 80 Cotton residents and only four of these residents had attended college and half of the residents he interviewed had not completed high school. It appears that with this population having a Spanish language instrument that can be easily administered is essential.

Campbell observed both English and Spanish-speaking enumerators and discovered that both had some difficulties with Spanish-speaking respondents. Campbell's noted:

Our observations covered both an Anglo-American enumerator and a Hispanic enumerator. Contrary to what might be expected, both enumerators had difficulties communicating with the respondents. In the case of the Anglo enumerator, the major problem was incomplete knowledge of Spanish and the consistent commission of linguistic mistakes.....The Hispanic enumerator's communication problems were somewhat different and are related to what I call the "my people" syndrome, that is the enumerator felt (incorrectly) there would be no linguistic misunderstandings because she was dealing with members of her own ethnic group. Unfortunately, as has been amply documented in a new book by sociologist Pablo Vila (*Crossing Borders, Reinforcing Borders*), Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, though sharing many common characteristics, are often divided by political, cultural, and linguistic barriers. In this case, the enumerator relied strictly on her native language abilities and ignored the Spanish job aid. But her Spanish vocabulary was often insufficient so she would revert to English terms in some cases. (Campbell, 2001:14)

Campbell's observation addresses a number of common misconceptions about Spanish-speaking enumerators. Because an enumerator speaks Spanish it does not necessarily mean that he or she can adequately conduct interviews in Spanish with respondents who do not speak English well or at all.(This same observation can be extended to other non-English languages.) Furthermore, training specifically targeted at conducting interviews with non-English speakers is needed. And lastly, we need to provide enumerators appropriate tools in order for them to do their jobs well.

As we will see later in this report when findings from focus groups with census enumerators are presented, the Spanish language guide was not regarded as useful and therefore was not used as intended in most cases.

Despite these observed difficulties Campbell notes that having Spanish speaking enumerators and cultural facilitators (many of whom performed as translators) was a step in the right direction with positive results. Campbell states:

The use of Spanish in enumeration in Cotton, however, made it possible for most of the residents to be counted by the Census Bureau. If, on the contrary, the Census had sent monolingual English enumerators only to the neighborhood, the census workers' ability to take the census adequately would have been greatly reduced. The participants in our three focus groups repeatedly told us that if Cotton residents had only been sent the English census form in the mail, the response rate would have been very low...Additionally, the use of cultural facilitators selected from the population of Cotton increased effective communication between the enumerators and the respondents. In the case of the Anglo enumerator discussed above, the cultural facilitator frequently served as a translator for the enumerator and thereby overcame communication barriers. (Campbell, 2001: 16)

As stated above, little or no knowledge of English was also a barrier in the other three sites and because respondents were left with an English language form (update/leave) and cultural facilitators were not used, some respondents put much effort and, in some cases expense, in order to respond to Census 2000.

A notary public was helping people fill out the census forms in [the site]. We learned from five respondents that this notary public helped people fill out immigration forms, tax forms, and other documents for a nominal fee. The notary public translated the questions and filled out the forms for the respondents. When we asked if they paid a fee for this service we were never given a direct answer. Perhaps, people were ashamed to admit that they had paid for the service of having their census form filled out. (Coronado and Duncan, 2001:16)

Noteworthy here is the apparent desire for colonia respondents to participate in Census 2000. This desire to "be counted" came across loud and clear in all four ethnographic reports. Reasons for this are complex and the authors offer a number of explanations including the need for empowerment (Coronado, 2001) and validation (Campbell, 2001). Nonetheless, the positive role of the Census Bureau's paid advertizing cannot be ignored as a contributing factor. This point came across clearly in all four ethnographic studies. Information on the success of the Census Bureau in these communities is provided in the section on concerns regarding confidentiality.

It is important to note that the ethnographic sites were distributed across three Census Bureau Regional Offices (RO).⁵ While the Census Bureau has standardized and uniform procedures to guide the conduct of the census, ROs often tailor procedures issued by Headquarters to better serve local needs and circumstances. This factor played an important role in how language and

⁵ The Dallas RO was in charge of census operations in the El Paso site, staff from the Denver RO conducted all census operations in the two Dona Ana County sites, and the Los Angeles RO oversaw all census operations in the Riverside County site.

literacy barriers were handled in these sites.

Census operations for the site in El Paso were conducted by the Dallas RO. This RO, in particular, took outreach and promotion measures that were above and beyond those employed at the national level. For example, the Dallas RO requested and received funding from Headquarters to hire *promotoras* or community outreach workers who were familiar with specific colonias and known by many colonia residents because of these individuals were also active in promoting public health in these communities. Moreover, the Dallas RO conducted their own Spanish language translations of selected documents provided by headquarters such as the notice of visit form.

In order to address the needs of some respondents, the Census Bureau made Spanish language census forms available to respondents who called the 1-800 number listed on the English language form. This was indeed the case in Nueva Esperanza, El Recuerdo, and Date Grove where update/leave was used. It appears that this approach to making Spanish language forms available to those who needed them did little to address the language barrier in these three colonias.

In-depth interviews conducted by all ethnographers in all four colonias indicate that the strategy of using the 1-800 number was not very successful. For example, in Date Grove Du Bry and Palerm report the following regarding their in-depth interviews with Date Grove residents:

None of the interviewees noticed the Spanish language message for assistance at the bottom of the first page. Careful attention was paid to see if anyone saw it, but no one even glanced at the bottom after filling Question #2. Because it lies at the end of a page written in English, we suspect most interviewees would not expect to find any part of the questionnaire to be in Spanish, and therefore overlook the message. Coupled with furtive glancing between the guide and questionnaire, it was possible that it became easily overlooked. (Du Bry and Palerm, 2001: 40)

Similarly, the use of the guide by respondents was not very successful. For example, in their interviews with residents of El Recuerdo, Velez-Ibanez and Nunez report:

First, the strategy of using an English questionnaire with primarily Spanish-speaking respondents is a basic error. Second, the use of a Spanish Guide often led to eye-response line confusion. The Spanish Guide had a significant mismatch in enumeration as well as specific omissions such as Question 2 of P1 (not translated in the Guide), confusing the respondents. Third, errors caused by the transfer of attention from the questionnaire to the Spanish Guide were frequent and led to tedium and to longer sessions than necessary. (Velez-Ibanez and Nunez, 2001: 6)

Although most colonia residents across all four sites are Spanish speakers, making generalizations and decisions on the language needs of these communities exclusively on this fact is not appropriate. Ethnographic data indicate that some colonia residents who self-identify as "Mexican" are not fluent in Spanish or do not speak Spanish at all. While most are Spanish

speakers their ability to understand and communicate in this language is varied because of low educational attainment, length of time in the U.S. and literacy level.

Although colonias on the U.S./Mexico border are, for the most part, ethnically homogeneous there is consensus among ethnographers that it is inappropriate to assume the same degree of homogeneity on other key dimensions such as language, the extent of social cohesion (i.e. community) among colonia residents and the level of infrastructure development.

A case in point is Cotton in El Paso County. Campbell states:

The ethnic homogeneity of a colonia should not be interpreted as de facto social cohesion anymore than would be the case in a predominantly white suburban neighborhood. Most colonias are not barrios per se. Barrios are Hispanic communities which have developed a common identity and tightly woven social networks over time. Since many colonias are brand new, such characteristics are often not fully developed. (Campbell, 2001: 13)

Regarding language, Coronado and Earle note that in focus groups that they conducted with residents of Nueva Esperanza some colonia residents who identified as "Mexican" did not speak Spanish. Thus, these focus groups were conducted in both English and Spanish.

Coronado and Earle state the following regarding linguistic diversity:

Linguistic diversity in colonias can be a divisive issue. One can innocuously offend a person by speaking to them in English when they only speak Spanish or by addressing them in Spanish when they prefer to speak English. This linguistic diversity should be addressed by the Census by providing the enumerators with bilingual forms. (Coronado and Duncan, 2001: 14)

Similarly Campbell reports that in his observations of Census 2000 enumerators he noticed that some enumerators in Cotton spoke to respondents in Spanish without first determining if the respondent spoke the language. In some cases respondents did not speak Spanish and the use of this language was not appropriate.

In sum, although ethnically homogeneous, colonias differ along other important dimensions that are important for census enumeration. In the four colonias in this study little or no knowledge of English was identified as a clear barrier. The extent to which this barrier was addressed is mixed. In Cotton the update/enumerate procedure and the use of cultural facilitators went a long way in addressing this problem.

4.1.3 Concerns regarding confidentiality

An unknown number of colonia residents are undocumented immigrants. Although the ethnographers did not ask site residents to disclose their legal status, ethnographic interviews and

the ethnographers' knowledge of the site reveal that there are undocumented immigrants living in these communities. For this reason we hypothesized that there would be apprehension on the part of site residents to participate in Census 2000.

Although the ethnographers did indeed find that there was concern among many residents across all four sites that the Census Bureau would share individual level data with other government agencies such as the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), they found that most colonia residents were willing to provide the information requested by their census form.

Coronado and Earle maintain that participating in Census 2000 provides colonia residents a sense of empowerment. Campbell notes a desire of colonia residents to participate in Census 2000. He states:

.....the generally positive reaction to the census by Cotton members was the issue of validation. It was obvious to the researchers that many Cotton households viewed the enumeration and research interview process as an opportunity to express pride in their families and their desire to be recognized by the larger society (Campbell, 2001: 18).

It is clear from ethnographic data that the Census Bureau's paid advertizing campaign, particularly efforts targeted at persons of Hispanic origin and those whose primary language is Spanish, fueled the desire among most colonia residents to be part of Census 2000. For example, in Date Grove Du Bry and Palerm noted the following regarding findings from his in-depth interviews with Date Grove residents:

All but two interviewees liked the Census advertisements. Reasons for liking them vary but they all echo the sentiment that the Census was trying to explain why and how Census 2000 was to be carried out. They appreciated the spirit of inclusiveness that the Census was conveying. Says one interviewee, "They were good because they inviting our people to participate in the Census, that it was a good thing." Another said "They are good for the people to know that the form is nothing to fear." And another said "I liked them because they talked about getting everyone to participate." One interviewee was particularly happy with the slogan the Census used in its Spanish advertisements: "We liked the message they had - Hagase Contar-Es Su Futuro." Others simply liked the idea that participating in the Census could bring much-needed assistance to their community, in the forms of help for schools and housing issues. One interviewee said she could relate to the advertisements "because they were like real-life. (Du Bry and Palerm, 2001: 66).

These sentiments were echoed by residents of the other three colonias. For example, Coronado and Earle report the following regarding focus groups that they conducted with residents of Nueva Esperanza:

Every single respondent was pleased with the commercials that they heard on the radio or saw on television. "*Dan ganas de llenar las formas*" ("It makes us want to fill out the forms") a respondent told us when we asked her about the commercials on television.

Respondents felt that the commercials directly appealed to them personally and that they had an inspiring message about participating in the census. People would repeat the messages that they heard on the commercials, “*hagase contar*” (“make yourself count”), “*para saber donde poner escuelas y hospitales*” (“so we can know where to put schools and hospitals”), etc. Television commercials were referred to more often than the ones on the radio. However, some people indicated that they heard the announcements on the radio, especially on KBNA, known as the “*que buena*” (how good!) in the community. People also commented on the number of fliers and posters around the community that promoted the census. Others added that it was nice that the information was provided in big print. Overall, the outreach effort had a powerful effect on people’s willingness to participate and on informing people about the census process. (Coronado and Earle, 2001: 21).

The desire to participate in the Census, however, was tempered by concerns related to a lack of trust of government representatives and non-community members in general. Campbell makes the following observation in his report:

....many residents of Cotton are suspicious of government representatives because of concerns about taxation, zoning ordinances, health regulations, and immigration matters. Besides government officials and religious proselytizers, few outsiders, other than visiting friends and family, enter Cotton colonia....During our fieldwork we encountered at least six households that actively avoided contact with enumerators or ourselves. Two of the people we approached about interviews appeared extremely anxious about our presence and one was openly hostile. Others simply refused to answer the door bell or used evasive excuses to avoid contact with census representatives or researchers. (Campbell, 2001: 17)

While the presence of distrust among community residents cannot be ignored, it appears that Census Bureau outreach efforts did a good job at counterbalancing this belief. Later Campbell states:

Nonetheless, most Cotton residents were very cooperative with the Census and researchers. Furthermore, most respondents seemed quite knowledgeable about the Census, had seen signs, television or radio advertisements for it, and trusted that the information they provided was kept confidential. Several Cotton children learned about the census at school. In one case, as we entered a respondent's house, her son said "Oh, cool, it's the census, I heard about this at school. (Campbell, 2001: 17).

There is some indication that while colonia residents took part in Census 2000 the information provided by some may not have been accurate. In Cotton Campbell also reports the following based on his observation of interviews conducted by census enumerators.

The residents gave ambiguous information about the ownership and occupancy of the dwellings. Respondents are reluctant to report such dwellings because of fear of being

punished for breaking zoning laws. (Campbell, 2001: 11).

Thus it appears that, for some, their willingness to participate in Census 2000 coupled with concerns regarding the confidentiality of census data resulted in reporting false or misleading information to the Census Bureau. Although it is not possible from these studies to get an indication of the prevalence of this practice, it is possible to note that this practice was circumvented on a number of occasions in Cotton where cultural facilitators accompanied census enumerators.

Reporting on his observations of the enumeration process in Cotton Campbell notes:

Additionally, the use of cultural facilitators selected from the population of Cotton increased effective communication between the enumerators and the respondents...the facilitator clarified that a male occupant of a trailer was actually the common-law spouse of the respondent and not her cousin as she had stated to the enumerator. The facilitator was able to clarify this in a way that was not embarrassing or offensive to the respondent. (Campbell, 2001: 16)

Despite suspicion of government in general (including the Census Bureau) there is indication that Census Bureau paid advertising campaign targeted at Hispanics had a positive impact. For instance in El Recuerdo Velez-Ibanez and Nunez reports:

Yet, even with this awareness and willingness to participate in the Census, many were still of the opinion that there needed to be even greater effort in dispelling fear and suspicion. The former is a consequence of the ever present threat of federal authorities such as the INS....Nevertheless few were convinced that the Census Bureau would share information with either the INS or other authorities and this conviction mainly arose from the comments made on the Cristina Show and other television programs. (Velez-Ibanez and Nunez, 2001: 10).

4.1.4 Complex and fluid households

Despite the presence of large households, many with unrelated individuals, complex households and mobile household members do not appear to have been a major barrier according to the ethnographers. This does not mean that problems were not encountered. Ethnographic data indicate that complex household arrangements were prevalent. However, these data also show that, for the most part, census enumerators were able to appropriately handle the enumeration of complex households and mobility of household members.

Overall, it appears that, although complex and fluid households were clear obstacles to enumeration, this feature of these communities was a relatively less important matter than the obstacles presented by irregular housing, little or no knowledge of English and low levels of education, and concerns regarding confidentiality.

The existence of complex household structure was clear in Cotton. Campbell describes this situation as follows:

Extended families are fairly common in Cotton. The most common pattern is for a nuclear family to be joined by the elderly parents of one of the spouses. Several families have relatives living in other houses in Cotton. In one particular case, at least 4 adjacent households are made up of close kin. In another case, a respondent noted that she lived with her male cousin, who later turned out to be her common-law husband. The fact that the man was actually her de facto spouse and not her cousin was clarified by the cultural facilitator who lived close by. Other than minor problems for enumeration such as this one, the only other relevant factor related to complex and fluid households in Cotton were relatives (usually the grandparents), often without residency papers, who lived in Mexico for part of the year and with their children and grandchildren in Cotton for several months at a time. Such people may not have been present on census day or may have been omitted by respondents due to concerns about confidentiality. (Campbell, 2001: 20)

Because of the large migrant worker population in Date Grove, Du Bry and Palmer observed that the second most common household type in this site were households composed of unrelated individuals. Du Bry's and Palerm's in-depth interviews revealed that respondents in these households often had problems deciding who to list on the census form since many members were not part of the household year-round. However, based on field observations it appears that enumerators were able to handle complex household situations. For example, Du Bry and Palmer reports the following based on his observation of a census enumerator that he calls Rosa:

Rosa walked up and explained to her that she was from the Census and she was here to enumerate this household. Nervously, the woman said that she did not understand why they wanted to enumerate her and her family. Rosa went on to explain that everyone is to be counted and that all information is confidential, trying to ease the woman's nervousness. Even though this did not reduce the woman's anxiety, she said she would answer the questions. The woman reported that there were four people living at the trailer. Looking over at the four cars parked in one of the grove rows, Rosa asked her if she was sure there were only four people at the trailer. The woman said shyly that her cousin's family was living in an addition to her trailer, and altogether there were nine people living at this residence. (Du Bry and Palerm, 2001: 29)

4.2 Findings From Focus Groups With Enumerators and Crew Leaders

4.2.1 Enumerator and crew leader training

Enumerator⁶ and crew leader training consisted of classroom training and on-the-job training. The duration of this training was about three days. In addition to lectures, participants were asked to complete in-class exercises and were provided with additional take-home assignments. Typically, crew leaders trained their own crew of enumerators. It was not unusual for a crew leader to have worked as an enumerator before taking on the responsibilities of a crew leader.

Enumerators and crew leaders did not report receiving specialized training relating to the enumeration of colonias.⁷ However, most respondents felt that the generic instruction provided addressed how to deal with the problems they encountered in colonias. These included, hidden housing units, irregular housing, rural style addresses, large households some with unrelated individuals, and respondents with little or no knowledge of English.

We believe that it was also helpful that most enumerators and crew leaders were assigned to areas with which they were familiar. Although not necessarily recognized as neighbors by colonia residents, some of these enumerators lived in colonias or were familiar with these settlements because friends or relatives lived in them.

Most focus group participants disliked the fact that trainers read the training lectures verbatim. It was noted that this mode of delivery was boring. However, some participants also reported that their trainer was able to keep the class interested in the material and motivated. In short, the delivery of the information was well received if the trainer was perceived as knowledgeable and able to adequately address questions raised by the participants.

When asked how the training they received could be improved, participants called for less lecture time and more time devoted to exercises. Almost all noted that on-the-job training should be expanded with a decreased amount of time in the classroom.

Regarding the training materials provided, a common assertion was that the training materials could have been better organized in one or two loose leaf binders with tabs for easy reference. Most focus group participants felt that too many separate documents were provided and consequently some felt overwhelmed and believed that there is a better way to organize and present this information.

Focus group participants reported not receiving any training on conducting Spanish language

⁶ As noted earlier, over 50 enumerators and more than 20 crew leaders and crew leader assistants participated in these focus groups. The major objective of these focus groups was to obtain the views and opinions of census enumerators and crew leaders on how Census 2000 was conducted in the four ethnographic research sites.

⁷ It is important to note that Regional Offices (RO) often augment or tailor enumerator training to fit local needs. For example, the Denver RO prepared extensive information on the physical layout of colonias for enumerators to use as reference material. The Dallas RO decided to implement update/enumerate in selected colonias instead of update/leave (the usual enumeration procedure for rural areas) and incorporated the use of cultural facilitators to better meet the needs selected border communities in Texas. These and other efforts are developed and initiated by ROs and implemented selectively, if resources are made available. Thus not all focus group participants were exposed to these specialized efforts.

interviews. Most said that training on how to conduct Spanish language interviews would be useful. A notable exception was enumerator training provided by the Dallas RO. In this RO cultural facilitators and *promotoras* worked along side enumerators in selected colonias. This added feature was reflected in the training and other preparation provided to enumerators in that RO.

4.2.2 Census materials

Census materials include documents such as census maps, notice of visit, and address lists as well as tools such as pencils, paper, and tote bags.

Most enumerators reported that the Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (TIGER) maps were not useful in locating their assignment areas. Once in their assigned areas, most focus group participants noted that the TIGER maps contained inaccurate information and some noted that map updates provided during the prec canvassing phase were not incorporated onto the maps they received for use in the conduct of the enumeration. Most focus group participants reported using personal funds to buy commercial maps in order to conduct their work.

Another census document that posed a problem was the notice of visit.⁸ When enumerators find that no one is home they are instructed to leave a notice that states that the household was visited by the Census Bureau and that a follow-up visit will occur. According to focus group participants there were two major problems with this material. It was only in English, so respondents who did not read English ignored the message or had to bring it to someone who could translate it. And the notice of visit did not have any adhesive or other device to secure it to the door.

Consequently, it was reported that it was difficult to secure notices on doors and many believed that the notices were lost.

There was unanimous agreement among focus group participants that the pencils provided were not very good. Consequently, many had to use their own resources to secure writing instruments.

4.2.3 Enumeration areas

⁸ Although this was a problem reported by focus group participants who were assigned to predominately Spanish-speaking areas, it is important to note that in the El Paso County site, the Dallas RO did its own translation of the notice of visit and other forms. Since this RO decided to use update/enumerate instead of update/leave in selected colonias (including Cotton) it had a special staff dedicated to this effort. In the other sites update/leave was the enumeration procedure of choice.

Not surprisingly, the potential barriers to enumeration identified in the ethnographic studies were also noted by focus group participants. According to focus group participants they were able to persevere and conduct the enumeration despite these barriers.

Unpaved roads was cited as a problem by many participants. Some reported getting flat tires and experiencing other car problems. However, no one reported abandoning an assignment because of these difficulties. Some suggested that, in the future, enumerators working in these difficult areas should be on a higher pay scale to compensate for the wear and tear on the car.

Dogs were also cited as problems or more of a nuisance. Again, focus group participants noted that they were able to negotiate these difficult situations. Some participants reported dog biting incidents but no one in the focus groups had experienced this situation.

Irregular housing was also a concern. Focus group participants provided numerous examples of hidden housing units and ambiguous housing arrangements. Along with these examples were descriptions of how this obstacle was successfully handled.

Little or no knowledge of English on the part of colonia residents was noted in the focus groups but not cited as a problem. Most enumerators in the focus groups who reported being able to speak Spanish, although the level of fluency varied from poor to excellent. Those who lacked the necessary language skills reported obtaining assistance from cultural facilitators or other Spanish-speakers. No one in our focus groups reported a language barrier that they could not overcome.

However, it was clear from focus group discussions that the ability to speak Spanish varied greatly among focus group respondents who reported to be Spanish speakers. Moreover, it was common for Spanish-speaking focus group participants to exhibit difficulty in explaining census concepts and other information necessary for the conduct of a successful enumeration in Spanish. Since Spanish language census forms were not readily available and since the Spanish language guide was perceived to be of limited use, focus group participants who claimed to have knowledge of Spanish reported translating census questions "on the fly."

4.2.4 Colonia residents

Virtually all focus group participants reported that colonia residents were aware of Census 2000 and realized the importance of their cooperation with this effort. Focus group participants credited this awareness to the paid Spanish language advertising television and radio campaign sponsored by the Census Bureau. Focus group participants attributed the overwhelming willingness to participate in Census 2000 was attributed to the paid advertising campaign and to the use of Spanish speaking census enumerators who were familiar with the population.

Although focus group participants reported that virtually all colonia residents they encountered

were willing to provide the necessary information, some focus group participants reported feeling that some household members were not declared as members of the household. When we questioned why they thought this was the case, many said that these unreported household members were not legal residents of the U.S. This assertion cannot be proven without doubt and the extent of this under reporting is not documented, but it is clear that this practice did occur.

Thus assurances of confidentiality were not always believed. The enumerators did hand out confidentiality statements in both English and Spanish, although some reported that respondents did not read the notice. Rather, enumerators had to explain the confidentiality assurance to the respondent.

4.2.5 The census questionnaire

As mentioned earlier, the El Paso County site was update/enumerate while the other three sites were update/leave. Thus enumerators visited only nonresponding households in these latter three sites and visited all households in the El Paso County site. It is also important to recall that in the update/leave procedures enumerators left an English language questionnaire for respondents to complete and return by mail. Respondents who wanted a Spanish language questionnaire would need to call the 800 number listed on the English language questionnaire and request one. There were also no Spanish language enumerator forms but rather a language guide for the enumerator to use as needed.

Most focus group participants who conducted an enumeration in Spanish reported not using the Spanish language guide provided by the Census Bureau. When asked why the guide was not used participants cited two major reasons. First, the Spanish translation of the English form contained words and phrases that most respondents found difficult to understand. It was therefore necessary to deviate from the translated text and improvise or just "translate on the fly." And second, focus group participants reported that the Spanish language guide was too cumbersome to use since enumerators also needed the English language census form to record responses.

Virtually all focus group participants reported that the census long form was difficult to administer. When asked to elaborate participants noted that the form was too long and took a long time to complete, especially in large households. Equally important, participants indicated that some respondents found some the long form questions sensitive and intrusive. For example, the income question was viewed as intrusive and, although conclusive evidence is not available, many enumerators noted that income was under reported. Other questions such as housing questions related to rooms in the home and plumbing were cited as questions that respondents did not want to address because they did not know the need for this information.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Overall, this research indicates that the Census 2000 enumeration of the four selected colonias identified areas where the enumeration process appears to have gone well as well as areas where

improvements are needed. Ethnographic observations and in-depth interviews and focus groups with colonia residents revealed that irregular housing, little or no knowledge of English coupled with limited formal education, lack of trust of government and outsiders by colonia residents, and complex households with mobile members presented significant challenges to the enumeration of the four selected colonias. These data also show that census enumerators were, for the most part, able to negotiate these obstacles with varying degrees of success.

Ethnographic observations indicate that, in general, census enumerators were able to address the situations they faced as a result of irregular housing. The most successful appear to be enumerators who worked along side cultural facilitators who knew the community and in many cases were members of the community being enumerated. Unfortunately, cultural facilitators were available only in the El Paso County site and not in the other three sites. The prevalence of irregular housing in colonias is well known and it appears, based on ethnographic observations and on focus group data, that enumerators felt that they were able to work in this environment. These data also show that hiring enumerators who were familiar with their assignment areas because they lived in or near these areas contributed to the ability of these enumerators to successfully negotiate the challenges posed by irregular housing.

This research suggests that new measures should be taken to facilitate the enumeration of persons who are solely or primarily Spanish speakers and who have little or no knowledge of English and low levels of educational attainment. While participants in focus groups conducted with enumerators and crew leaders who self-identified as Spanish speakers reported not having difficulty in enumerating Spanish speaking respondents, ethnographic observations and focus group discussions indicate that the ability of enumerators and crew leaders to communicate in Spanish varied greatly.

It was common for these Spanish-speaking enumerators to exhibit difficulty in explaining census concepts and other information necessary for the conduct of a successful enumeration in Spanish. Since Spanish language census forms were not readily available and since the Spanish language guide was perceived to be of limited use, focus group data as well as ethnographic observations indicate that translation "on the fly" was common. While this study did not evaluate the impact of this practice on data quality and other outcomes, the lack of consistency and standardization introduced by this practice is not desirable when conducting standardized data collection.

All ethnographers maintain that a Spanish language instrument that can be easily understood by respondents and smoothly administered by census enumerators would have improved the enumeration process in the four selected colonias. In focus group discussions enumerators and crew leaders expressed the desire to have a Spanish language instrument that can facilitate the conduct of Spanish language interviews and decrease the time that it takes to conduct an interview in Spanish.

Ethnographic data also showed that the use of cultural facilitators and *promotoras* in the El Paso County site coupled with the use of update/enumerate helped mitigate the difficulties associated

with the enumeration barriers identified in this report. Unfortunately, the remaining three colonias discussed in this report did not benefit from these measures.

There is clear and consistent indication from all information sources examined for this study (ethnographic data, informal interviews, in-depth interviews, and focus groups) that the paid Spanish language Census 2000 advertizing significantly enhanced awareness of Census 2000 in the four selected colonias. Although the data do not allow us to make a definite link between census awareness and response, there is qualitative information that supports the assertion that the Spanish language Census 2000 paid advertizing campaign enhanced the motivation of colonia residents to support Census 2000 through their participation in the census.

Moreover, because one of the key themes of Census 2000 outreach and promotion messages was the importance of census participation to the improvement of a community's infrastructure, residents of the four selected colonias embraced and supported Census 2000. In fact, the data indicate that despite concerns of some colonia residents regarding the confidentiality of the information provided to the Census Bureau, information required by the census form and sought by census enumerators was provided.

While the message that participation in Census 2000 will benefit the community appears to have been effective in the four border communities discussed in this report, ethnographers who conducted the fieldwork expressed concern that if improvements in community infrastructure do not follow Census 2000 the Census Bureau will find it very challenging to repeat its success in outreach and promotion in future censuses.

This report also shows that of the of the three regional offices (ROs) represented in this study, the Dallas RO appears to have been relatively more aggressive in its outreach and promotion efforts with the use of *promotoras* and cultural facilitators. The ethnographer in the El Paso County site observed that these tailor-made efforts were very well received by community residents and appeared to be effective and complementary to broader paid Spanish language Census 2000 advertizing campaign. Despite the challenges identified and described in this report, there are aspects of the Census Bureau's enumeration of the four colonias in our study that worked well.

The use of Spanish speaking enumerators and the assignment of these enumerators to areas that were familiar to them was a strategy that seemed to have worked well. Focus groups with census enumerators and crew leaders revealed that knowledge of Spanish was key in gaining cooperation. Further, familiarity with colonias was an essential element that seemed to have enhanced job performance.

Local census offices also initiated activities to ensure a successful census in colonias. The local census office (LCO) in Las Cruces, NM developed an action plan specifically for colonias in NM. Prior to the census enumeration the Las Cruces LCO sent out census staff to colonias in the area to document conditions that may make enumerating in Census 2000 difficult. This information was systematically collected and compiled so that when Census 2000 was underway

the LCO could send the appropriate enumerators to these hard to enumerate areas.

Additionally, the Dallas Regional (RO) entered into a partnership with Texas A&M University to enlist the assistance of health promoters who worked in Texas colonias as outreach workers or *promotoras*. Focus groups with census enumerators and crew leaders working in El Paso County noted that *promotoras* played a key role in promoting awareness of Census 2000 in the colonias. Other notable successful efforts attributable to the Dallas RO included the decision to use the list/enumerate procedure in colonias where local knowledge indicated that community residents may have difficulty with an English language census form and the translation of selected census materials into Spanish.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the research reported here, we have the following recommendations:

- Build on the successful efforts employed during Census 2000 in the El Paso County colonia (Cotton) in the conduct of future censuses. That is, use cultural facilitators with local knowledge to work alongside census enumerators. Use this model in selected test sites before 2010 Census in order to better understand this approach and formalize it through the establishment of standardized training and procedures. These efforts will facilitate exporting this approach to communities along the U.S./Mexico border where irregular housing, limited knowledge of English, and suspicion of government and non-community members are prevalent.
- Learn from the experience of not making Spanish language census forms readily available in colonias and gain knowledge from not providing census enumerators with a Spanish language instrument that can be easily used. This research indicates that in border communities, such as the four discussed in this report, a Spanish language census form and a Spanish language data collection instrument for census enumerators can greatly facilitate the enumeration process. Conduct research on these approaches in selected test sites before 2010 Census in order to fine tune the ways in which this approach can be applied across all border communities, while taking into account the unique features and needs that some of these settlements have.
- Revise and augment the training used to train enumerators and crew leaders assigned to colonias to more appropriately address the concerns raised in the focus groups with census enumerators and crew leaders. For example, reduce the volume of paper and other materials distributed during the course of the training by digitizing much of this information and developing automated self-study modules. Train census enumerators who will be assigned to list/enumerate and nonresponse follow up in border communities to conduct interviews with respondents who are Spanish speakers and have

little or no knowledge of English.

- Build on the apparent success of the Spanish language Census 2000 outreach and promotion campaign. Conduct further research to examine one of the key messages of this campaign. Namely, participating in Census 2000 will benefit your community. While this message appears to have been effective in Census 2000 in the four border communities discussed in this report, ethnographers who conducted the fieldwork expressed concern that if improvements in community infrastructure do not follow Census 2000 the Census Bureau will find it very challenging to repeat its success in outreach and promotion in future censuses. Conduct further research to develop new messages that will motivate border community residents to participate in 2010 Census without the risk of raising expectations.

References

Ethnographic studies

Campbell, H. (2001). Colonias on the U.S./Mexico Border: Barriers to Enumeration in Census 2000. Cotton Colonia -- El Paso County, Texas. Report prepared for the project *Colonias on the US/Mexico Border: Barriers to Enumeration in Census 2000*. Produced under contract 43 YABC 156129 with the U.S. Census Bureau.

Coronado, I and Earle, D. (2001) Colonias on the US-Mexico Border Barriers to Enumeration: The Case of Colonia Nueva Esperanza. Report prepared for the project *Colonias on the US/Mexico Border: Barriers to Enumeration in Census 2000*. Produced under contract 43 YABC 123456 with the U.S. Census Bureau.

Du Bry, T and Palerm, J.V. (2001) Census 2000 in a California Farm Laborer Community: Date Grove and the Coachella Valley. Report prepared for the project *Colonias on the US/Mexico Border: Barriers to Enumeration in Census 2000*. Produced under contract 43 YABC 239483 with the U.S. Census Bureau.

Velez-Ibanez, C. and Nunez, G. (2001) Report: 1999-2000 Census Project, El Recuerdo Colonia. Report prepared for the project *Colonias on the US/Mexico Border: Barriers to Enumeration in Census 2000*. Produced under contract 43 YABC 163872 with the U.S. Census Bureau

Other references

Acosta, Jesse, (1998). "Las Colonias- Census 2000 Workshop." U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Chapa, J. and del Pinal, J. (1993) "Enumeration, Housing Characteristics and Sampling Rates in

the Colonias of the Texas Border Area: A Perspective on Census Data." *Proceedings of the 1993 Research Conference on Undercounting Ethnic Populations of the U.S. Census Bureau*, Washington, D.C. pp. 247-273.

de la Puente, M. (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 Undercounting Ethnic Populations of the U.S. Census Bureau*, Washington, D.C. pp. 29-66.

Fernandez, E. (1991). The Hispanic Population of the U.S. Southwest Borderland. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 172, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Kourous, G. (1998) "Colonias: Problems and Promise." *Boarderlines*, Volume 6, Number 1.

Office of the Attorney General, State of Texas (1996) *Texas Colonias: A Strategic Plan for the Future*.

Ratliffe, M. (1998). "Enumerating and Publishing Data for Colonias for Census 2000." *Boarderlines Updater*. May 14, 1998.