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## Executive Summary

This report used sex ratios to examine the consistency in the 1988 Dress Rehearsal data. As an evaluation tool, sex ratios have limited application because subgroups in the population may have sex ratios that deviate considerably from expected values. However, as a general indicator of the quality of the data, the sex ratios can point to unexpected extremities in the age-sex distribution.

The Post-Enumeration Survey (PES) produced the P-sample, the E-sample and the Dual System Estimates. Sex ratios were computed for these three data sources for different post-strata and compared with the original census enumeration. The post-stratum represents the finest level of detail for which dual system estimates are produced. The post-strata are defined by characteristics of the persons enumerated in the PES. The strata are as homogeneous as possible with respect to *the census undercount.

Comparisons were made in all three Dress Rehearsal sites: St. Louis, Missouri, East Central Missouri, and Eastern Washington State. A sex ratio above 100 denotes an excess of males; a sex ratio below 100 denotes an excess of females. Overall, based on the sex ratios, the estimates for St. Louis and East Central Missouri were reasonable, with ratios close to one hundred for the younger age groups, and declining sex ratios for the older cohorts. In Washington State, the sex ratios showed more deviations than the sex ratios in the other two test sites.

The differences between the sex ratios within each site were also examined. In particular, it was of interest to notice the deviations of the E-, P- and the DSE results from the original enumeration. Such differences may reflect large sampling errors rather than differences in coverage. To evaluate these differences, their standard errors were computed. Significant differences ( $\mathrm{p}<.05$ ) appeared in all three sites.

All significant differences between the $P$-sample and the census were negative, indicating that the P-sample had lower sex ratios than the census, i.e., that it produced less males. The E-sample had a number of significant differences when comparisons were made with the census. In one test site, St. Louis, one of the significant differences was negative, and six of these differences were positive, suggesting that the DSE produced several sex ratios that were higher than the census and not within sampling error. In the other two test sites, there were one and two significant DSEcensus differences, respectively. All three differences had negative signs.

## 1. Background

In 1988, the Census Bureau conducted a Dress Rehearsal program of the 1990 census procedures. The Post-Enumeration Survey (PES) was an important aspect of this program, because the data from the survey were used to evaluate coverage in the census. The Dress Rehearsal was conducted in three sites: St. Louis, Missouri, East Central Missouri, and Eastern Washington State. These test sites were chosen because they represented different enumeration conditions and data processing methodologies.

To measure net coverage, the PES requires two samples: the P-sample and the E-sample. The Psample is a population sample obtained independently from the census. It is used to measure omissions. The E-sample is an enumeration sample. It consists of all enumerations assigned to the sample blocks by the census process. It is used to measure duplicates and other errors included in the count. An estimate of the total population is formed from these two samples using the dual system estimator (DSE).

This report evaluates the age-sex distributions in the census and the PES data. More specifically, it examines sex ratios produced from the original enumeration (census), the P-sample, the E-sample and the dual system estimator (DSE).

## 2. Analysis of Sex Ratios

Sex ratios can be used to evaluate if the overall results are reasonable. The sex ratio is usually defined as the number of males per 100 females, or

$$
\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{m}} / \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}}\right) \times 100
$$

where,
$P_{m}$ represents the number of males and $P_{f}$ the number of females.

One hundred is the point of balance of the sexes according to this measure. Thus, a sex ratio above 100 denotes an excess of males; a sex ratio below 100 denotes an excess of females. Accordingly, the greater the excess of males, the higher the sex ratio; the greater the excess of females, the lower the sex ratio.

The estimates are computed for different PES post-strata. The post-strata represent the finest level of detail for which dual system estimates are produced. The post-strata are defined by characteristics of the persons enumerated in the PES and are as homogeneous as possible with respect to the census undercount. The St. Louis data are post-stratified according to race and home-ownership. For the East Central Missouri data, post-stratification is done according to race and type of enumeration area. Only type of enumeration area is used to post-stratify the data from Washington State.

## 3. Results

Tables 1, 2 and 3 (Appendix A) and Graphs 1 through 12 (Appendix B) show the distribution of the age-sex ratios by stratum in the three different test sites. (On the graphs, East Central Missouri has been designated as Columbia). Sex ratios are shown for the original enumeration (census), the - E-sample, the P-sample and the dual system estimator (DSE). The data used to calculate the sex ratios are presented in the Appendix C.

### 3.1. Sex Ratio Results in St. Louis

Table 1 compares the sex ratios for St. Louis. For white non-Hispanic renters, both the original enumeration (census) and the dual system estimator (DSE) show an excess of males in the 0-9 and the 30-44 age groups. (In the age group 30-44, the DSE ratio shows a large excess of males (124.00)). Also, the P-sample age group $10-19$ has a sex ratio above 100 . In all other age groups, and in particular in the age group 65+, there are more females than males - a pattern found in all four data sources. A graphical presentation of the sex ratios for this stratum is provided in Graph 1.

The data collected for white non-Hispanic owners reveal a similar sex ratio pattern. Up to age 45, this subpopulation has more males than females in the census. This pattern is found in the Esample with the exception of age group 10-19, and in the DSE with the exception of age group 0 9. In the P-sample, an excess of males is found in only the $30-44$ age group. In the $45+$ ages, there are more females than males in all four data sources (Graph 2).

In the census, the stratum 'all other renters' is primarily a female distribution with the exception of the first age group (0-9). The same pattern appears in the E- and the P-sample. In the DSE estimates, there are less males than females in all age groups except 10-19, where there are 105 males per 100 females (Graph 3).

The 'all other owners' stratum has an almost perfect balance of the sexes for age group 0-9 in the census and the P -sample. However, in the E-sample and the DSE, the population in this age group is less male. In other age categories, the patterns in the four data sources are similar. In the 20-29 age groups, there are more males than females, but otherwise the distributions are 'female' (Graph 4).

Finally, calculations have been made for the total St. Louis sample. Looking at these sex ratios, the overall estimates are reasonable with ratios close to one hundred for the younger age groups, and declining sex ratios for the older cohorts (Graph 5). In St. Louis, there are between 83 and 86 males for every 100 females.

### 3.2. Sex Ratio Results in East Central Missouri

*Sex ratios for the enumerations in the East Central Missouri Tape Address Register area (TAR) are shown in Table 2. For the white non-Hispanic population, there are more males than females in the census and the DSE in the younger age group. Similarly, in age group 30-44, the number of males exceeds the number of females in both the P-sample and the DSE (Graph 6).

The population in non-TAR areas shows an excess of males in the first two age groups ( $0-9$ and $10-19$ ), then a gradual tapering off (Graph 7).

Table 2 also shows the sex ratios for 'all other persons' in East Central Missouri. The census and the E-sample show a population that is primarily female. The only exception is age group $0-9$, where there are 103-104 males for every 100 females. The P-sample and the DSE results do not produce the same pattern. In the age group 20-29 ( P -sample) and 30-44 (DSE), there are 112 males per 100 females, and in the P -sample the age group $45-64$ has 108 males per 100 females. In all other age groups, the sex ratio is below 100 (Graph 8).

Finally, the census and the DSE sex ratios for 'all persons' in East Central Missouri show an excess of males in the 0-9 age group, and a balance of the sexes in the 10-19 age group. In all other age groups, there is an excess of females in all four distributions. For the total population, the overall sex ratio results look reasonable (Graph 9). In East Central Missouri, there are between 91 and 97 males for every 100 females.

### 3.3 Sex Ratio Results in Washington State

Table 3 shows the data for Washington State. In List/Enumerate areas, the census shows an excess of males in all age groups except $65+$. The E-sample produced a population with a large
excess of males in three age groups: 0-9, 20-29 and 65+. The P-sample shows an excess of males only in the age groups $0-9$ and $45-64$. Finally, the DSE has an excess of males in the $10-19,30-$ 44 and 45-64 age groups. Overall, the ratios appear to deviate from the expected pattern of more females than males with increasing age (Graph 10).

In areas categorized as 'not in List/Enumerate', the sex ratio pattern is more consistent across the four distributions. The age group 20-29 shows a very large excess of males over females (between 112-141 males per every 100 females) (Graph 11).

Finally, for all persons in Washington State, the DSE and the census differ primarily for two age groups: $0-9$ and 20-29. The DSE has the population less male in the youngest age group, and more male in the 20-29 age group than the census. Overall, for the total population, the DSE shows more deviation from the original results in this test site than in the other two sites (Graph -12).

## 4. Sex Ratio Differences

The differences between the sex ratios are compared next. The differences are documented in Tables 4, 5, and 6 and graphically in Charts A through L (Appendix D). Again, for the three different test sites, the results are shown for the differences between the E-sample and the census, the P-sample and the census, and the DSE and the census. The term 'census' refers to the original enumeration. To evaluate these differences, standard errors were computed. The standard errors are presented in parenthesis. Differences, significant at the .05 level or better, are indicated with a star. The discussion will focus only on significant differences.

### 4.1 Sex Ratio Differences in St. Louis

There are eleven significant differences in the St. Louis data set. The DSE resulted in significantly more males than the census in the age group 30-44 in the white non-Hispanic renter' stratum. The same conclusions can be reached for the 'all other renter' and the 'all persons' strata. In the 'all other renters' stratum, the DSE also produced more males in the 'overall' category. In the 'all persons' stratum, the DSE had significantly more males in the 30-44, 45-64 and the 'total population' categories. Only in the 0-9 age group is the sign on the significant difference between the DSE and the census sex ratios negative. The difference between the E-sample and the census is significant for only one age group: 0 -9. In this age group, the E-sample is more male than the census. Finally, one stratum: 'white non-Hispanic owners' contains all the significant differences between the P-sample and the census. Significant differences are found in the age groups 10-19, 20-29 and for the total population. All significant differences are negative, indicating that the P -
sample in these age categories was less 'male' than the census. It should be noted that there are no significant differences in the 'all other owners' stratum (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Significant Sex Ratio Differences by Stratum and Age Group for St. Louis

| Stratum | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65+ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White Non-Hisp. Renter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSE | --- | --- | --- | (+) | --- | --- | --- |
| White Non-Hisp, Owner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | (-) | (-) | --- | --- | --- | (-) |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSE | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Other Renter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| E | (+) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- |
| DSE | $(-)$ | --- | --- | (+) | --- | --- | (+) |
| All Other Owners |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- |
| DSE | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Persons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- |
| DSE | --- | --- | --- | (+) | (+) | --- | (+) |

### 4.2 Sex Ratio Differences in East Central Missouri

There are four significant differences in the East Central Missouri data set. In the 'all other persons' stratum, in the age group 10-19, the DSE is significantly lower than the census sex ratios, i.e., less male. The E-sample shows significant differences in the total population in two strata: White non-Hispanic (TAR) and 'all persons.' In both cases, the differences are negative. Only one significant difference emerged for the P -sample: age group $0-9$ in the 'white non-Hispanic (TAR)' stratum. The difference is negative, indicating that there were less males in the P-sample than in the census. There were no significant differences in the 'white non-Hispanic not in TAR' stratum (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Significant Sex Ratio Differences by Stratum and Age Group for E.C.Missouri

| Stratum | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65+ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White Non-Hisp. (TAR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | (-) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | (-) |
| DSE | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- |
| White Non-Hisp,(non-TAR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| - DSE | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- |
| All Other Persons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSE | --- | (-) | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- |
| All Persons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | $\cdots$ | --. | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | (-) |
| DSE | --- | --- | --- | --- | --. | --- | --- |

### 4.3 Sex Ratio Differences in Washington State

There are ten significant differences in the Washington State data set. The DSE is significantly lower than the census sex ratios in the age group 0-9 in List/Enumerate areas. This effect is found again in the 'all persons' stratum. The E-sample has significant differences in List/Enumerate areas in three age groups: $10-19,30-44$, and 65+. These differences are significant for the E-sample in the 'all person' stratum for two of the three age groups: 30-44 and 65+. Finally, the P-sample has
significant differences in all three strata for the age group 30-44. The differences are negative, indicating that the census enumeration had more males than the P -sample.

Table 4.3 Significant Sex Ratio Differences by Stratum and Age Group for Washington

| Stratum | 0-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65+ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| List/Enumerate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | (-) | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | (-) | --- | (-) | --- | (+) | --- |
| DSE | (-) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not Lis//Enumerate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | (-) | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSE | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Persons |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | --- | --- | --- | (-) | --- | --- | --- |
| E | --- | --- | --- | (-) | --- | (+) | --- |
| DSE | (-) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

## 5. Conclusion

The age-sex ratios of the census, the E-sample, the P-sample and the dual system estimator were examined in this report. The analyses were performed by dress rehearsal test site and poststratum. As an evaluation tool, sex ratios have limited application because subgroups in the population may have sex ratios that deviate considerably from expected values. However, as a general indicator of the quality of the data, the sex ratios can point to unexpected extremities in the age-sex distribution. When the results of this report are compared with the sex ratios for the U.S. total population, deviations from expectations can be seen. For example, the census enumerations in the 'all persons' stratum in St. Louis, follow a pattern similar to that of the 1980 black national
population with sex ratios higher than 100 for the first age group and then tapering off with increasing age. The-sex ratios in East Central Missouri show conformity with the white national population for ages past 30 . For the age groups $10-19$ and $20-29$, both the census and the dual system estimates are lower than expected, i.e., point to a population with fewer males. Finally, in Washington State, the dual system estimator produces a sex ratio for the age group 20-29 that is much more male than both the national average and the census enumerations. (The sex ratios for the U.S. population by race are shown in Table 7).

Differences between the sex ratios in the four different data sources were also examined. In particular, it was of interest to notice the deviations of the E-, P- and the DSE results from the original enumeration. Such differences may reflect large sampling errors, rather than differences in coverage. Thus, standard errors were computed and differences significant at the .05 level or - better were emphasized in the discussion. In St. Louis, there were eleven significant differences. Only four significant differences emerged in East Central Missouri. Finally, in Washington State, there were ten significant differences.

The significant differences within each site were also examined by data source. There were six significant differences between the $P$-sample and the census. All differences were negative, indicating that the P-sample had lower sex ratios than the census, i.e., that it produced fewer males. The E-sample had eight significant differences when comparisons were made with the census. In St. Louis, the E-sample difference was positive, i.e., more male than the census. In E.C. Missouri, on the other hand, the effect was that of less male in the E-sample than in the census. In Washington State, there were five significant E-sample differences, some positive and some negative, suggesting biases in the sample selection.

Finally, focusing on the differences between the DSE and the census, there were ten significant differences across the three sites. In one test site, St. Louis, one of the significant differences was negative, and six of these differences were positive, suggesting that the DSE produced several sex ratios that were larger than the census and not within sampling error. In the other two test sites, there were one and two significant DSE-census differences, respectively. All three differences had negative signs.
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Table 1. Sex Ratios by Data Source, Age and Stratum - St. Louis

| Age | Census |  |  |  |  |  | E-sample P-sample |  | DSE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | Non-Hispanic | Renters: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 80.42 | 84.16 | 85.99 | 83.27 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 102.64 | 91.67 | 89.09 | 107.75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10-19$ | 84.55 | 88.39 | 106.43 | 72.04 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $20-29$ | 92.52 | 97.19 | 88.53 | 90.87 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $30-44$ | 106.49 | 92.46 | 949 | 124.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $45-64$ | 82.46 | 80.49 | 84.16 | 89.13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $65+$ | 34.51 | 45.79 | 51.13 | 33.41 |  |  |  |  |  |

White Non-Hispanic Owners:

| Total | 89.46 | 86.10 | 79.97 | 90.28 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 108.20 | 105.56 | 91.47 | 90.28 |
| $10-19$ | 105.65 | 91.41 | 76.39 | 110.10 |
| $20-29$ | 105.44 | 102.33 | 87.68 | 103.65 |
| $30-44$ | 106.91 | 117.22 | 107.98 | 107.85 |
| $45-64$ | 84.86 | 82.13 | 82.56 | 86.28 |
| $65+$ | 60.86 | 55.18 | 54.67 | 60.98 |

All Other Renters:

| Total | 75.78 | 78.57 | 79.63 | 82.18 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 100.75 | 121.98 | 110.29 | 92.00 |
| $10-19$ | 96.89 | 86.46 | 95.39 | 105.69 |
| $20-29$ | 68.88 | 63.27 | 70.52 | 81.49 |
| $30-44$ | 63.80 | 60.49 | 69.23 | 74.45 |
| $45-64$ | 64.43 | 65.40 | 56.16 | 72.08 |
| $65+$ | 46.91 | 58.59 | 51.27 | 51.11 |

Table 1 cont.
All Other Owners:

| Total | 86.59 | 86.14 | 86.86 | 88.15 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0-9$ | 99.22 | 86.82 | 99.02 | 92.19 |
| $10-19$ | 102.58 | 97.59 | 90.67 | 103.27 |
| $20-29$ | 102.78 | 113.74 | 113.18 | 106.46 |
| $30-44$ | 88.25 | 86.81 | 91.74 | 90.75 |
| $45-64$ | 71.30 | 75.67 | 72.49 | 74.50 |
| $65+$ | 70.16 | 68.91 | 71.88 | 69.29 |

All Persons In St. Louis:

| Total | 82.83 | 83.31 | 82.35 | 85.79 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0-9$ |  |  |  |  |
| 102.43 | 106.45 | 100.43 | 97.92 |  |
| $20-19$ | 98.27 | 89.98 | 91.37 | 100.23 |
| $20-29$ | 88.98 | 87.59 | 84.73 | 92.67 |
| $30-44$ | 89.99 | 86.24 | 89.39 | 97.49 |
| $45-64$ | 76.53 | 76.89 | 74.85 | 80.43 |
| $65+$ | 52.83 | 56.73 | 56.66 | 52.82 |

Table 2. Sex Ratios by Data Source, Age and Stratum East Central Missouri
Age Census E-sample P-sample DSE

White non-Hispanic (TAB):

| Total | 90.71 | 78.78 | 87.43 | 95.65 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0-9$ | 105.87 | 85.53 | 78.85 | 109.73 |
| $10-19$ | 83.64 | 77.52 | 93.45 | 84.66 |
| $20-29$ | 95.08 | 71.17 | 80.02 | 98.33 |
| $30-44$ | 95.84 | 84.98 | 104.42 | 112.10 |
| $45-64$ | 87.31 | 89.60 | 93.02 | 88.39 |
| $65+$ | 64.19 | 72.92 | 73.77 | 65.22 |

White non-Hispanic (not in TAR):

| Total | 96.39 | 93.75 | 95.40 | 97.23 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0-9$ |  |  |  |  |
| $10-19$ | 107.25 | 99.87 | 104.81 | 111.66 |
| $20-29$ | 96.38 | 106.59 | 104.66 | 106.29 |
| $30-44$ | 98.71 | 94.26 | 97.39 | 95.24 |
| $45-64$ | 95.87 | 96.60 | 95.43 | 97.85 |
| $65+$ | 74.32 | 71.38 | 94.08 | 98.12 |
|  |  |  | 76.98 | 73.58 |

All Other Persons:

| Total | 93.06 | 76.86 | 87.55 | 95.04 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 103.68 | 104.81 | 72.57 | 95.51 |
| $10-19$ | 97.13 | 66.52 | 81.03 | 83.77 |
| $20-29$ | 91.82 | 75.24 | 112.56 | 94.74 |
| $30-44$ | 93.26 | 81.08 | 83.37 | 112.42 |
| $45-64$ | 82.14 | 97.85 | 107.66 | 91.77 |
| $65+$ | 70.21 | 33.59 | 57.51 | 68.60 |

Table 2 cont.

All Persons in East Central Missouri:

| Total | 93.35 | 90.61 | 94.16 | 96.86 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 106.81 | 98.73 | 100.67 | 109.97 |
| $10-19$ | 101.77 | 98.55 | 102.18 | 100.53 |
| $20-29$ | 95.68 | 85.85 | 94.07 | 96.02 |
| $30-44$ | 97.97 | 91.10 | 95.83 | 100.66 |
| $45-64$ | 94.44 | 95.93 | 94.35 | 96.98 |
| $65+$ | 73.23 | 70.64 | 76.32 | 72.65 |

Table 3. Sex Ratios by Data Source, Age and Stratum Washington State
Age Census E-sample P-sample DSE

Persons in List/Enumerate Areas:

| Total | 102.8 | 104.6 | 97.2 | 101.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 106.5 | 120.5 | 122.6 | 89.9 |
| $10-19$ | 110.6 | 95.1 | 81.4 | 117.2 |
| $20-29$ | 101.1 | 132.3 | 91.7 | 96.3 |
| $30-44$ | 105.8 | 94.3 | 91.9 | 107.4 |
| $-45-64$ | 101.8 | 91.5 | 110.0 | 111.5 |
| $65+$ | 88.8 | 121.7 | 86.8 | 84.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Persons not in List/Enumerate Areas:

| Total | 99.9 | 102.1 | 97.1 | 103.7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0-9$ |  |  |  |  |
| $10-19$ | 106.6 | 106.2 | 106.3 | 102.5 |
| $20-29$ | 112.4 | 127.5 | 107.3 | 100.8 |
| $30-44$ | 99.8 | 120.4 | 141.1 | 135.2 |
| $45-64$ | 93.2 | 87.4 | 75.8 | 102.4 |
| $65+$ | 76.8 | 81.9 | 96.7 | 89.2 |
|  |  |  | 78.8 | 76.0 |

All Persons in Washington State:

| Total | 101.3 | 103.5 | 97.2 | 102.2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0-9$ |  |  |  |  |
| $10-19$ | 106.5 | 114.8 | 115.7 | 95.5 |
| $20-29$ | 108.2 | 105.8 | 88.5 | 108.2 |
| $30-44$ | 102.9 | 91.0 | 112.8 | 119.6 |
| $45-64$ | 97.9 | 95.9 | 85.3 | 105.1 |
| $65+$ | 83.3 | 101.8 | 105.0 | 101.7 |
|  |  | 83.0 | 80.7 |  |

Table 4. Sex Ratio Differences - St. Louis

| Age $\quad$ E-sample $\quad$ P-sample $\quad$ DSE |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | -Census (s.e.) -Census (s.e.) -Census (s.e.) |

White non-Hispanic Renters:

| Total | +3.74 | $(5.77)+5.57$ | $(6.36)+2.85$ | $(2.96)$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $0-9$ | -10.97 | $(17.85)$ | -13.55 | $(16.54)$ | +5.11 | $(8.42)$ |
| $10-19$ | +3.84 | $(17.31)$ | -21.88 | $(27.60)$ | -12.51 | $(8.92)$ |
| $20-29$ | +4.67 | $(10.23)$ | -3.99 | $(10.98)$ | -1.65 | $(6.67)$ |
| $30-44$ | -14.03 | $(10.57)$ | -11.71 | $(13.87)$ | $+17.51^{*}$ | $(7.52)$ |
| $45-64$ | -1.97 | $(10.21)$ | +1.70 | $(8.33)$ | +6.67 | $(4.67)$ |
| $65+$ | +11.28 | $(12.87)$ | +16.62 | $(14.15)-1.10$ | $(1.76)$ |  |

White non-Hispanic Owners:

| Total | -3.36 | $(3.61)-9.49^{*}$ | $(3.51)+.82$ | $(.90)$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $0-9$ | -2.64 | $(20.10)$ | -16.73 | $(17.59)$ | +1.90 | $(5.16)$ |  |
| $10-19$ | -14.24 | $(13.82)$ | $-29.26^{*}$ | $(9.85)$ | +1.14 | $(3.80)$ |  |
| $20-29$ | -3.31 | $(10.45)$ | $-17.76^{*}$ | $(7.40)$ | -1.79 | $(3.74)$ |  |
| $30-44$ | +10.31 | $(6.91)$ | -1.07 | $(6.94)$ | + | .94 | $(1.60)$ |
| $45-64$ | -2.73 | $(7.34)$ | -2.30 | $(6.77)$ | +1.42 | $(1.52)$ |  |
| $65+$ | -5.68 | $(4.16)$ | -6.19 | $(4.86)+$ | .12 | $(.56)$ |  |

All Other Renters:

| Total | +2.79 | $(5.14)+3.85$ | $(7.13)+6.40^{*}$ | $(2.05)$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-91.23^{*}$ | $(10.48)$ | +9.54 | $(8.41)-8.75^{*}$ | $(4.05)$ |  |  |
| $10-19$ | -10.43 | $(6.71)$ | -1.50 | $(13.02)$ | +8.80 | $(5.08)$ |
| $20-29$ | -5.61 | $(5.99)$ | +1.64 | $(12.38)$ | +12.61 | $(7.40)$ |
| $30-44$ | +3.31 | $(12.79)$ | +5.43 | $(18.38)$ | $+10.65^{*}$ | $(5.07)$ |
| $45-64$ | +.97 | $(10.59)$ | -8.27 | $(6.32)$ | +7.65 | $(4.28)$ |
| $65+$ | +11.68 | $(14.58)$ | +4.36 | $(7.61)$ | +4.20 | $(3.08)$ |

Table 4 cont.

$$
\equiv-
$$

All Other Owners:

| Total | -.45 | $(2.40)+.27$ | $(2.28)+1.56$ | $(1.86)$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | -12.40 | $(9.33)-.20$ | $(8.35)-7.03$ | $(6.12)$ |  |
| $10-19$ | -4.99 | $(10.83)$ | -12.11 | $(8.91)+.69$ | $(3.53)$ |
| $20-29$ | +10.96 | $(8.80)$ | +10.40 | $(12.41)+3.68$ | $(8.07)$ |
| $30-44$ | -1.44 | $(6.11)$ | +3.49 | $(6.75)+2.50$ | $(3.12)$ |
| $45-64$ | +4.37 | $(3.91)+1.19$ | $(3.77)+3.20$ | $(2.33)$ |  |
| $65+$ | -1.25 | $(5.33)+1.72$ | $(5.66)+.87$ | $(1.74)$ |  |

All Persons in St. Louis:

| $*$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | +.48 | $(2.27)+.48$ | $(3.24)+2.96$ | $(1.13)$ |
| $0-9$ | +4.02 | $(7.62)-2.00$ | $(6.80)-4.51^{*}$ | $(2.70)$ |
| $10-19$ | -8.29 | $(5.67)-6.90$ | $(7.12)+1.96$ | $(2.53)$ |
| $20-29$ | -1.39 | $(4.51)-4.25$ | $(6.38)+3.69$ | $(4.16)$ |
| $30-44$ | -3.75 | $(5.81)-.60$ | $(7.00)+7.50^{*}$ | $(2.56)$ |
| $45-64$ | +.36 | $(3.45)-1.68$ | $(3.12)+3.90^{*}$ | $(1.61)$ |
| $65+$ | +3.83 | $(4.37)+3.90$ | $(3.82)+.01$ | $(.92)$ |

Table 5. Sex Ratio Differences - East Central Missouri

| Age | E-sample -Census |  | P-sample |  | DSE <br> -Census | (s.e.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White non-Hispanic (TAR): |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | -11.93* | (5.69) | 3.28 | (6.37) | + 4.94* | (2.61) |
| 0-9 | -20.34 | (11.50 | -27.02* | (11.93) | $+3.86$ | (5.34) |
| 10-19 | 6.12 | (14.31) | 9.81 | (17.15) | + 1.02 | (8.16) |
| 20-29 | -23.91 | (10.85) | -15.06 | (9.58) | $+3.25$ | (6.08) |
| 30-44 | -10.86 | (7.90) | + 8.58 | (17.19) | +16.26 | (14.14) |
| 45-64 | + 2.29 | (5.94) | + 5.71 | (10.76) | + 1.08 | (3.52) |
| $65+$ | + 9.58 | (6.30) | $+8.73$ | (6.96) | + 1.03 | (1.26) |

White non-Hispanic (not in TAR):

| Total |  | 2.64 | (2.11) |  | . 99 | (3.68) | $+$ | . 84 | 5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-9 |  | 7.38 | (5.17) |  | 2.44 | (12.30) |  | 4.41 | (7.48) |
| 10-19 | $+$ | . 39 | (8.62) | - | 1.54 | (10.02) | $+$ | . 09 | (2.43) |
| 20-29 | - | 2.12 | (5.41) |  | 1.01 | (6.40) | $+$ | 1.14 | (2.26) |
| 30-44 | - | 6.11 | (4.76) | - | 3.28 | (4.29) | $+$ | 86 | (2.67) |
| 45-64 | + |  | (4.70) |  | 1.79 | (4.69) | $+$ | 25 | (2.87) |
| $65+$ |  | 2.94 | (5.30) | $+$ | 2.66 | (8.59) | $+$ | . 76 | (.82) |

All Other Persons:

| Total | -16.20 | $(26.24)$ | -5.51 | $(9.68)$ | +1.98 | $(4.70)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $0-9$ |  |  | 1.13 | $(23.78)$ | -31.11 | $(17.73)$ |
| $10-19$ | -30.61 | $(92.47)$ | -16.10 | $(20.98)$ | -13.17 | $(17.26)$ |
| $20-29$ | -16.62 | $(28.93)$ | +20.74 | $(34.70)$ | +2.92 | $(11.80)$ |
| $30-44$ | -12.18 | $(15.81)$ | -9.89 | $(17.41)$ | +19.16 | $(17.82)$ |
| $45-64$ | +15.71 | $(18.10)$ | +25.52 | $(29.91)$ | +9.63 | $(14.29)$ |
| $65+$ | -36.62 | $(7.97)$ | -12.70 | $(19.24)$ | +1.61 | $(1.66)$ |

Table 5 cont.

## All Persons in East Central Missouri:

| Total $-4.74^{*}$ | $(2.39)-1.19$ | $(3.28)+1.51$ | $(1.11)$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | -8.08 | $(4.75)-6.14$ | $(10.46)+3.16$ | $(6.24)$ |  |  |
| $10-19$ | -3.22 | $(10.43)-$ | .41 | $(8.96)-1.24$ | $(2.37)$ |  |
| $20-29$ | - | 9.83 | $(5.23)$ | -1.61 | $(5.93)$ | +.34 |
| $30-44$ | -6.87 | $(4.36)$ | -2.14 | $(4.47)$ | +2.69 | $(3.58)$ |
| $45-64$ | + | 1.49 | $(4.14)$ | -.09 | $(4.16)$ | +2.54 |
| $65+$ | -2.59 | $(4.67)$ | +3.09 | $(7.70)+$ | .58 | $(.74)$ |

Table 6. Sex Ratio Differences - Washington State

| Age | E-sample $\quad$ P-sample |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | -Census (s.e) -Census (s.e.) - Census (s.e.) |

Persons in List/Enumerate Areas:

| Total | +1.77 | $(5.74)$ | -5.60 | $(10.46)$ | -1.80 | $(2.28)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0-9$ | +13.50 | $(21.68)$ | +16.10 | $(29.05)$ | $-16.00^{*}$ | $(6.10)$ |
| $10-19$ | $-15.50^{*}$ | $(7.09)$ | -29.20 | $(25.74)$ | +6.60 | $(12.98)$ |
| $20-29$ | -31.20 | $(19.60)$ | -9.40 | $(24.48)$ | -4.80 | $(13.98)$ |
| $30-44$ | $-11.50^{*}$ | $(5.62)$ | $-13.90^{*}$ | $(5.87)$ | +1.60 | $(3.39)$ |
| $45-64$ | -10.30 | $(5.63)$ | +8.20 | $(12.64)$ | +9.70 | $(8.90)$ |
| $65+$ | $+32.90^{*}$ | $(13.42)$ | -2.00 | $(22.29)$ | -4.20 | $(4.73)$ |

Persons not in List/Enumerate Areas:

| Total | +2.16 | $(7.62)$ | -2.80 | $(7.62)$ | +3.47 | $(4.02)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0-9$ | -.40 | $(23.46)$ | -.30 | $(15.06)$ | -4.10 | $(4.68)$ |
| $10-19$ | +25.10 | $(21.57)$ | +4.90 | $(22.18)$ | -1.60 | $(4.61)$ |
| $20-29$ | -8.00 | $(24.31)$ | +28.70 | $(30.51)$ | +22.80 | $(15.54)$ |
| $30-44$ | -12.40 | $(11.38)$ | $-24.00^{*}$ | $(11.58)$ | +2.60 | $(5.40)$ |
| $45-64$ | +10.10 | $(9.82)$ | +3.50 | $(9.80)$ | +4.00 | $(2.77)$ |
| $65+$ | +5.10 | $(7.92)$ | -2.00 | $(6.88)$ | -80 | $(2.04)$ |

All Persons in Washington State:

| Total | +2.16 | $(4.46)$ | -4.20 | $(6.78)$ | +.81 | $(2.29)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0-9$ | +8.30 | $(15.79)$ | +9.20 | $(17.59)$ | $-11.00^{*}$ | $(4.02)$ |
| $10-19$ | -.50 | $(9.51)$ | -17.80 | $(19.70)$ | +1.90 | $(6.32)$ |
| $20-29$ | +17.80 | $(15.06)$ | +4.60 | $(19.60)$ | +11.40 | $(11.19)$ |
| $30-44$ | $-11.60^{*}$ | $(5.80)$ | $-17.60^{*}$ | $(5.55)$ | +2.20 | $(3.08)$ |
| $45-64$ | -2.00 | $(5.29)$ | +7.10 | $(8.76)$ | +3.80 | $(4.96)$ |
| $65+$ | $+18.50^{*}$ | $(6.96)$ | -.30 | $(10.07)$ | -2.60 | $(2.67)$ |


| Table 7. Sex | Ratios -1980 | Resident U.S. Population |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Age | White | Black |  |
| $0-9$ |  | 105.30 | 101.62 |
| $10-19$ | 104.36 | 100.32 |  |
| $20-29$ | 101.16 | 89.75 |  |
| $30-44$ | 98.68 | 84.17 |  |
| $45-64$ | 91.82 | 81.04 |  |
| $65+$ | 67.28 | 68.25 |  |

## APPENDIX B

Graph 1. Sex Ratios. White non-Hispanic Renters - St. Louis
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Graph 2. Sex Ratios. White non-Hispanic Owners - St. Louis
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Graph 4. Sex Ratios. All Other Owners - St.Louis
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Graph 5. Sex Ratios. All Persons In St. Louis
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Graph 6. Sex Ratios. White non-Hispanic (TAR) - Columbia
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Graph 7. Sex Ratios. White non-Hispanic (not in TAR) - Columbia
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Graph 8. Sex Ratios. All Other Persons - Columbia
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Graph 9. Sex Ratios. All Persons in Columbia
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Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In The City Of Saint Louis, Missouri

Table 1 White Nonhispanic Nonowners In Saint Louis. Missouri

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Male |  |  |  | 5536 |
| $0-9$ | 5334 | 6203 | 5104 | 53089 |
| $10-19$ | 3271 | 3691 | 3822 | 30879 |
| $20-29$ | 11566 | 9097 | 7664 | 12479 |
| $30-44$ | 9977 | 9080 | 9093 | 11972 |
| $45-64$ | 5364 | 6550 | 6173 | 5692 |
| $65+$ | 4063 | 2887 | 2697 | 4105 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 5197 | 6767 | 5729 | 5138 |
| $10-19$ | 3868 | 4176 | 3591 | 4288 |
| $20-29$ | 12501 | 9360 | 8657 | 13733 |
| $30-44$ | 9369 | 9820 | 9594 | 9655 |
| $45-64$ | 6505 | 8138 | 7335 | 6386 |
| $65+$ | 11773 | 6305 | 5275 | 12286 |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In The City Of Saint Louis, Missouri

Table 2 White Nonhispanic Owners In Saint Louis. Missouri

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 7008 | 6344 | 5432 | 7217 |
| $10-19$ | 5797 | 5446 | 4648 | 5948 |
| $20-29$ | 7517 | 7809 | 6213 | 7291 |
| $30-44$ | 13297 | 12187 | 10791 | 13319 |
| $45-64$ | 11667 | 11765 | 11261 | 11309 |
| $65+$ | 10172 | 9617 | 9033 | 10000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 6477 | 6010 | 5946 | 6555 |
| $10-19$ | 5487 | 5958 | 6100 | 5570 |
| $20-29$ | 7127 | 7631 | 7092 | 7034 |
| $30-44$ | 12437 | 10397 | 10003 | 12350 |
| $45-64$ | 13749 | 14325 | 13684 | 13108 |
| $65+$ | 16713 | 17429 | 16563 | 16398 |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In The City Of Saint Louis, Missouri

## Table 3 All Other Nonowners In Saint Louis. Missouri

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Male | 12892 | 16682 | 14181 | 14530 |
| $0-9$ | 10324 | 11396 | 10868 | 12154 |
| $10-19$ | 8385 | 8857 | 9101 | 10793 |
| $20-29$ | 8560 | 9102 | 8860 | 10598 |
| $30-44$ | 5238 | 5247 | 4576 | 5889 |
| $45-64$ | 3377 | 3093 | 2380 | 3676 |
| $65+$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 12796 | 13676 | 12861 | 15793 |
| $0-9$ | 10655 | 13181 | 11393 | 11500 |
| $10-19$ | 12173 | 13998 | 12906 | 13245 |
| $20-29$ | 12416 | 15047 | 12797 | 14235 |
| $30-44$ | 8130 | 8023 | 8148 | 8170 |
| $45-64$ | 7199 | 5279 | 4642 | 7193 |
| $65+$ |  |  |  |  |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In The City Of Saint Louis, Missouri

## Table 4 All Other Owners In Saint Louis. Missouri

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 5245 | 4729 | 4341 | 5881 |
| $10-19$ | 6475 | 5710 | 5247 | 7357 |
| $20-29$ | 6180 | 6017 | 5127 | 7367 |
| $30-44$ | 6892 | 6773 | 6410 | 7524 |
| $45-64$ | 7467 | 7445 | 7067 | 8065 |
| $-65+$ | 5029 | 4754 | 4384 | 4923 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Eemale |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 5286 | 5447 | 5787 | 6379 |
| $10-19$ | 6312 | 5851 | 4530 | 7124 |
| $20-29$ | 6013 | 5290 | 4530 | 6920 |
| $30-44$ | 7810 | 7802 | 6987 | 8291 |
| $45-64$ | 10472 | 9838 | 9749 | 10825 |
| $65+$ | 7168 | 6899 | 5907 | 7105 |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In The City Of Saint Louis, Missouri

Table 5 All Persons in Saint Louis. Missouri

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 30479 | 33958 | 29269 | 33163 |
| $10-19$ | 25867 | 26243 | 24830 | 28548 |
| $20-29$ | 33648 | 31779 | 28283 | 37929 |
| $30-44$ | 38736 | 37142 | 35380 | 43413 |
| $45-64$ | 29736 | 31007 | 29268 | 30956 |
| $65+$ | 22641 | 20350 | 18525 | 22704 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 29756 | 31900 | 29143 | 33866 |
| $10-19$ | 26322 | 29166 | 27175 | 28483 |
| $20-29$ | 37816 | 36279 | 33381 | 40931 |
| $30-44$ | 43032 | 43066 | 39581 | 44531 |
| $45-64$ | 38856 | 40324 | 39103 | 38489 |
| $65+$ | 42853 | 35913 | 32657 | 42982 |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In East Central Missouri

Table 6 White Nonhispanic Persons in Columbia. MO (The East Central Missouri Tape Address Register Area)

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample (weighted) | P-sample (weighted) | DSE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| 0-9 | 3682 | 2382 | 1763 | 3655 |
| 10-19 | 4411 | 2172 | 2167 | 5294 |
| 20-29 | 9398 | 6831 | 5332 | 11112 |
| 30-44 | 6319 | 4361 | 4295 | 7430 |
| 45-64 | 3688 | 3170 | 2918 | 3654 |
| $65+$ | 1893 | 1822 | 1649 | 1875 |
| Femäle |  |  |  |  |
| 0-9 | 3478 | 2785 | 2236 | 3331 |
| 10-19 | 5274 | 2802 | 2319 | 6253 |
| 20-29 | 9884 | 9598 | 6663 | 11301 |
| 30-44 | 6593 | 5132 | 4113 | 6628 |
| 45-64 | 4224 | 3538 | 3137 | 4134 |
| $65+$ | 2949 | 2470 | 2260 | 2875 |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In East Central Missouri

Table 7 White Nonhispanic Persons In The Remainder Of The East Central Missouri Test Site

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{\text { Male }}{}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 27748 | 24167 | 24579 | 30546 |
| $10-19$ | 25438 | 22784 | 22318 | 26114 |
| $20-29$ | 24507 | 20410 | 20129 | 26128 |
| $30-44$ | 37097 | 31606 | 31879 | 39089 |
| $-45-64$ | 32855 | 29829 | 29803 | 34496 |
| $65+$ | 19721 | 15386 | 17403 | 19330 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 25872 | 24199 | 23472 | 27356 |
| $10-19$ | 23953 | 21376 | 21323 | 24568 |
| $20-29$ | 25427 | 21653 | 20669 | 27435 |
| $30-44$ | 37581 | 34130 | 33404 | 39949 |
| $45-64$ | 34272 | 30879 | 31680 | 35124 |
| $65+$ | 26534 | 21554 | 22606 | 26270 |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In East Central Missouri

Table 8 All Other Persons In The East Central Missouiri Test Site

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 2736 | 1589 | 1093 | 3001 |
| $10-19$ | 2165 | 2345 | 1256 | 2127 |
| $20-29$ | 2817 | 2914 | 1523 | 3368 |
| $30-44$ | 2766 | 1624 | 1484 | 3476 |
| $45-64$ | 1242 | 911 | 1091 | 1395 |
| $-65+$ | 535 | 215 | 222 | 5338 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 2639 | 1516 | 1644 | 3142 |
| $10-19$ | 2229 | 3525 | 1550 | 2539 |
| $20-29$ | 3068 | 3873 | 1353 | 3555 |
| $30-44$ | 2966 | 2003 | 1780 | 3092 |
| $45-64$ | 1512 | 931 | 1019 | 1520 |
| $65+$ | 762 | 640 | 386 | 777 |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In East Central Missouri

Table 9 All Persons In The East Central Missouri Test Site

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample (weighted) | P-sample (weighted) | DSE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 34166 | 28138 | 27535 | 37201 |
| 10-19 | 32014 | 27301 | 25740 | 33535 |
| 20-29 | 36722 | 30155 | 26984 | 40608 |
| 30-44 | 46182 | 37591 | 37658 | 49995 |
| 45-64 | 37785 | 33910 | 33812 | 39545 |
| $65+$ | 22149 | 17423 | 19273 | 21738 |
| Eemale |  |  |  |  |
| 0-9 | 31989 | 28499 | 27353 | 33829 |
| 10-19 | 31456 | 27704 | 25192 | 33359 |
| 20-29 | 38379 | . 35124 | 28685 | 42292 |
| 30-44 | 47140 | 41265 | 39297 | 49669 |
| 45-64 | 40008 | 35348 | 35836 | 40778 |
| $65+$ | 30245 | 24663 | 25253 | 29923 |

Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In Eastern Washington State

Table 10 Persons In The Eastern Washington Test Site, In List/Enumerate Areas

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 11434 | 15122 | 12907 | 11282 |
| $10-19$ | 10136 | 12629 | 12604 | 10422 |
| $20-29$ | 7841 | 9027 | 7620 | 8906 |
| $30-44$ | 15138 | 15891 | 15917 | 16809 |
| $45-64$ | 12850 | 15552 | 17045 | 15121 |
| $65+$ | 8222 | 9381 | 7230 | 7885 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 10737 | 12551 | 10524 | 12554 |
| $10-19$ | 9161 | 13285 | 15482 | 8896 |
| $20-29$ | 7752 | 6825 | 8307 | 9245 |
| $30-44$ | 14305 | 16845 | 17316 | 15656 |
| $45-64$ | 12622 | 17004 | 15489 | 13558 |
| $65+$ | 9262 | 7711 | 8331 | 9321 |

# Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In Eastern Washington State 

## Table 11 Persons In The Eastern Washington Test Site, Not In List/Enumerate Areas

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample (weighted) | P-sample (weighted) | DSE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 9898 | 8653 | 8350 | 10342 |
| 10-19 | 10564 | 8430 | 6283 | 10893 |
| 20-29 | 14402 | 9140 | 8715 | 18617 |
| 30-44 | 13250 | 11923 | 9218 | 13915 |
| -45-64 | 9563 | 10656 | 9186 | 9529 |
| $65+$ | 5963 | 6306 | 5980 | 5926 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 9284 | 8150 | 7855 | 10087 |
| 10-19 | 10318 | 6613 | 5854 | 10807 |
| 20-29 | 12812 | 7592 | 6177 | 13775 |
| 30-44 | 13274 | 13635 | 12165 | 13589 |
| 45-64 | 10265 | 10313 | 9495 | 10684 |
| $65+$ | 7747 | 7698 | 7593 | 7793 |

## Results of the 1988 Dress Rehearsal Post-Enumeration Survey Test Site In Eastern Washington State

Table 12 All Persons In The Eastern Washington Test Site

| Age in Years | Census | E-sample <br> (weighted) | P-sample <br> (weighted) | DSE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male |  |  |  |  |
| $0-9$ | 21332 | 23775 | 21257 | 21625 |
| $10-19$ | 20700 | 21059 | 18887 | 21315 |
| $20-29$ | 22243 | 18167 | 16335 | 27523 |
| $30-44$ | 28388 | 27814 | 25136 | 30724 |
| $45-64$ | 22413 | 26208 | 26231 | 24650 |
| $65+$ | 14175 | 15688 | 13211 | 13811 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 20021 | 20701 | 18379 | 22641 |
| $0-9$ | 19479 | 19898 | 21336 | 19703 |
| $10-19$ | 20564 | 14417 | 14484 | 23020 |
| $20-29$ | 27579 | 30480 | 29480 | 29245 |
| $30-44$ | 22887 | 27317 | 24984 | 24243 |
| $45-64$ | 17009 | 15409 | 15924 | 17114 |
| $65+$ |  |  |  |  |
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