

# TABLE FINDING GUIDE

## Subjects by Type of Geographic Area and Table Number

[Subjects covered in this report are shown on the left side, and types of geographic areas are shown at the top. Tables 1 through 12 show 100-percent characteristics. Tables 13 through 32 show sample characteristics. For a description of area classifications, see appendix A. For definitions and explanations of subject characteristics, see appendix B]

Subject	State and congressional district	County	Place and (in selected States) county subdivision (10,000 or more) <sup>1</sup>	American Indian and Alaska Native area
<b>POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS</b>				
Age .....	1, 2, 17*	2	2	6
Voting age persons.....	1, 2, 17*	2	2	6
Ancestry .....	13	...	...	...
Citizenship .....	13, 14	...	...	...
Class of worker .....	15	...	...	...
Disability .....	14, 21	21	21	...
Educational attainment.....	14, 17*, 19	19	19	23
Family type and presence of own children.....	13, 17*, 18	18	18	...
Fertility.....	13	...	...	...
Group quarters .....	1, 4	4	4	...
Hispanic origin.....	1, 3, 17*	3	3	...
Household type and relationship .....	1, 4	4	4	...
Income in 1989 .....	16, 17*, 22	22	22	23
Industry .....	15	...	...	...
Labor force status.....	15, 17*, 20	20	20	23
For persons 16 to 19 years by school enrollment and educational attainment.....	15, 17*	...	...	...
Labor force status in 1989—				
Weeks and hours worked .....	15, 20	20	20	...
Land area.....	1, 5	5	5	...
Language spoken at home and ability to speak English.....	14, 18	18	18	...
Marital status .....	13	...	...	...
Means of transportation to work.....	14, 20	20	20	...
Nativity .....	13, 14, 18	18	18	...
Occupation .....	15	...	...	...
Period of military service.....	14	...	...	...
Place of birth .....	14, 18	18	18	...
Population density.....	5	5	5	...
Poverty status in 1989 .....	16, 17*, 22	22	22	23
Race .....	1, 3, 17*	3	3	...
Residence in 1985 .....	14, 18	18	18	...
School enrollment and type of school.....	14, 17*, 19	19	19	23
Sex.....	1, 3, 17*, 20	3, 20	3, 20	6
Urban, rural, and farm residence (persons).....	13	...	...	...
Veteran status .....	14, 19	19	19	...
Workers in family in 1989 .....	15	...	...	...

... Not applicable for this report.

\* Data for table 17 are shown for White; Black; American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut; Asian or Pacific Islander; and Hispanic origin.

<sup>1</sup>The selected States are: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

# TABLE FINDING GUIDE

## Subjects by Type of Geographic Area and Table Number

[Subjects covered in this report are shown on the left side, and types of geographic areas are shown at the top. Tables 1 through 12 show 100-percent characteristics. Tables 13 through 32 show sample characteristics. For a description of area classifications, see appendix A. For definitions and explanations of subject characteristics, see appendix B]

Subject	State and congressional district	County	Place and (in selected States) county subdivision (10,000 or more) <sup>1</sup>	American Indian and Alaska Native area
<b>HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS</b>				
Age of householder .....	26	...	...	...
Bedrooms .....	24, 29	29	29	...
Condominium status .....	26, 29	29	29	...
Contract rent .....	7, 10	10	10	12
Gross rent .....	26, 28*, 31	31	31	32
Hispanic origin of householder .....	11, 28*	11	11	...
House heating fuel .....	25, 30	30	30	...
Household income in 1989 .....	26, 27	...	...	...
Household type and relationship .....	...	...	...	12
Householder 65 years and over .....	25	...	...	...
Kitchen facilities .....	25, 29	29	29	...
Land area .....	...	...	...	12
Meals included in rent .....	10	10	10	...
Mortgage status and selected monthly owner costs .....	27, 28*, 31	31	31	32
Persons per room .....	7, 8, 25	8	8	...
Persons in unit .....	26	...	...	...
Persons per unit .....	9, 10	9, 10	9, 10	...
Plumbing facilities .....	25, 28*, 29	29	29	32
Race of householder .....	11, 28*	11	11	...
Rooms .....	7, 8, 9, 10	8, 9, 10	8, 9, 10	...
Sewage disposal .....	25, 29	29	29	...
Source of water .....	25, 29	29	29	...
Telephone in unit .....	25, 30	30	30	...
Tenure .....	9, 10, 28*	9, 10	9, 10	12, 32
Tenure by race and Hispanic origin of householder .....	7	...	...	...
Units in structure .....	7, 8, 9, 10, 24	8, 9, 10	8, 9, 10	...
Vacancy characteristics .....	7, 8	8	8	...
Value .....	7, 9	9	9	12
Vehicles available .....	25, 28*, 30	30	30	32
Year householder moved into unit .....	26, 31	31	31	...
Year structure built .....	24, 29	29	29	...

... Not applicable for this report.

\* Data for table 28 are shown for White householder; Black householder; American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut householder; Asian or Pacific Islander householder; and householder of Hispanic origin.

<sup>1</sup>The selected States are: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

# USER NOTES

Additional information concerning this 1990 census product may be available at a later date. If you wish to receive these *User Notes*, contact:

Data User Services Division  
Customer Services  
Bureau of the Census  
Washington, DC 20233  
301-763-4100

Questions concerning the content of this report may be directed to:

Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division  
Bureau of the Census  
Washington, DC 20233

Population Division  
Bureau of the Census  
Washington, DC 20233

## ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS OF DATA

### GENERAL

#### User Note 1

**Age Reporting**—Review of detailed 1990 information indicated that respondents tended to provide their age as of the date of completion of the questionnaire, not their age on April 1, 1990. In addition, there may have been a tendency for respondents to round up their age if they were close to having a birthday. It is likely that approximately 10 percent of persons in most age groups are actually 1 year younger. For most single years of age, the misstatements are largely offsetting. The problem is most pronounced at age 0 because persons lost to age 1 may not have been fully offset by the inclusion of babies born after April 1, 1990, and because there may have been more rounding up to age 1 to avoid reporting age as 0 years. (Age in completed months was not collected for infants under age 1.)

The reporting of age 1 year older than age on April 1, 1990, is likely to have been greater in areas where the census data were collected later in 1990. The magnitude of this problem was much less in the three previous censuses where age was typically derived from respondent data on

year of birth and quarter of birth. (For more information on the design of the age question, see the discussion on comparability under “Age” in appendix B.)

#### User Note 2

The user should note that there are limitations to many of these data. Please refer to the text provided with this report for further explanations on the limitations of the data.

#### User Note 3

This report series (CPH-4) includes 100-percent and sample data for population and housing characteristics. Tables 1 through 6 present data on general population characteristics based on tabulations of 100-percent data and tables 7 through 12 show 100-percent housing data. Tables 13 through 23 show sample data on social and economic characteristics and tables 24 through 32 show sample housing data.

#### User Note 4

Congressional districts of the 103rd Congress reflect boundaries based on the 1990 census for all States except Maine, where redistricting occurs in 1993. Court or legislative action may change congressional district boundaries in any State for subsequent Congresses during the decade. The Census Bureau will issue revised CPH-4 reports for any State undergoing further redistricting action based on the 1990 census.

#### User Note 5

Estimated population and housing unit totals based on tabulations from only the sample questionnaires (sample tabulations) may differ from the official counts as tabulated from every census questionnaire (100-percent tabulations). Such differences result, in part, because the sample tabulations are based on information from a sample of households rather than from all households (sampling error). Differences also can occur because the interview situation (length of questionnaire, effect of the interviewer, etc.) and the processing rules differ between the 100-percent and sample tabulations. These types of differences are referred to as nonsampling errors. (For more information on nonsampling error, see appendix C.)

The 100-percent data are the official counts and should be used as the source of information on population and housing items collected on the 100-percent questionnaire,

such as age, race, Hispanic origin, number of rooms, and tenure. This is especially appropriate when the primary focus is on counts of the population or housing units for small areas such as census tracts/BNA's, block groups, and for American Indian and Alaska Native areas. For estimates of counts of persons and housing units by characteristics asked only on a sample basis (such as education, labor force status, income, and source of water), the sample estimates should be used within the context of the error associated with them.

Many users are interested in tabulations of items collected on the sample cross-classified by items collected on a 100-percent basis such as age, race, sex, Hispanic origin, and housing units by tenure. Given the way the weights were applied during sample tabulations, generally, there is exact agreement between sample estimates and 100-percent counts for total population and total housing units for most geographic areas. At the State level and higher geographic levels, sample estimates and 100-percent counts for population by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin and for housing units by tenure, number of rooms and so on would be reasonably similar and, in some cases, the same.

At smaller geographic levels, including census tract/BNA, there is still general agreement between 100-percent counts and sample estimates of total population or housing units. At smaller geographic levels, however, there will be expected differences between sample estimates and 100-percent counts for population by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin and for housing units by tenure, number of rooms and so on. In these cases, users may want to consider using derived measures (such as means and medians) or percent distributions. Whether using absolute numbers or derived measures for small population groups and for a small number of housing units in small geographic areas, users should be cautioned that the sampling error associated with these data may be large.

Even though the differences between sample estimates and 100-percent counts for these categories are generally small, the differences for the American Indian, as well as the Hispanic origin populations, are relatively larger than for other groups. The following provides some explanation for these differences.

State-level sample estimates of the number of American Indians are generally higher than the corresponding 100-percent counts. It appears the differences are primarily the result of proportionately higher reporting of "Cherokee" tribe on sample questionnaires. This phenomenon occurs primarily in off-reservation areas. The reasons for the greater reporting of Cherokee on sample forms are not fully known at this time. The Census Bureau will do research to provide more information on this phenomenon.

For the Hispanic origin population, sample estimates at the State level are generally lower than the corresponding 100-percent counts. The majority of difference is caused by the 100-percent and sample processing of the Hispanic question on the sample questionnaire when the respondent did not mark any response category. When processing the sample, written entries in race or Hispanic origin as well as responses to questions only asked on the sample, such as ancestry and place of birth. These procedures led to a lower proportion of persons being assigned as Hispanic in sample processing than were assigned during 100-percent processing. The Census Bureau will evaluate the effectiveness of the 100-percent and sample procedures.

As in previous censuses, the Census Bureau will evaluate the quality of the data and make this information available to data users. In the meanwhile, both 100-percent and sample data serve very important purposes and, therefore, should be used within the limitations of the sampling and nonsampling errors.

## **User Note 6**

Data presented in tables 27 and 31 for "Median selected monthly owner costs as a percentage of household income in 1989" (With a mortgage), "Median selected monthly owner costs as a percentage of household income in 1989" (Not mortgaged), and "Median gross rent as a percentage of household income in 1989" are inconsistent with the explanations for derived measures in appendix B. Specifically, when the median falls in the lower interval of the tabulation distribution, the estimated value obtained by linear interpolation is shown rather than the upper value of the category followed by a minus sign (-). The lower interval has an assumed range of 0.0 to 19.9 percent.